MOVEMENTS IN JUDAISM

PUBLISHED

ZIONISM. By Richard J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D., Professor of Semitic Languages in Columbia University, New York City.

IN PREPARATION

HELLENISM. By Norman Bentwich, author of "Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria," and "Josephus."

MYSTICISM. By Joseph H. Hertz, Ph. D., Chief Rabbi of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

PHARISAISM. By Solomon Schechter, M. A., Litt. D., President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, author of "Studies in Judaism."

RATIONALISM. By Isaac Husik, Ph. D.

REFORM JUDAISM. By Samuel Schulman, D. D., Rabbi of Temple Beth-El, New York City.

MOVEMENTS IN JUDAISM

ZIONISM

אם אין אני לי מי לי

Theodor Herzl

MOVEMENTS IN JUDAISM

ZIONISM

BY

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL
Professor of Semitic Languages in Columbia University, New York
Sometime President of the Federation of American Zionists

PHILADELPHIA
THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA
1914

Copyright, 1914,
by
The Jewish Publication Society of America

TO

E. G.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	Foreword	13
I.	The Pre-Herzlites	17
II.	The Colonization of Palestine	48
III.	Leo Pinsker and Autoemancipation	60
IV.	Theodor Herzl	82
V.	The Jewish Congress	108
VI.	The Post-Herzlian Period	143
VII.	Some Phases of Zionistic Theory	165
VIII.	Ahad ha-Am and the Philosophy of Jewish History	181
IX.	Zionism and the Western Jews	198
	Notes	217
	Bibliography	233
	Index	235

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Theodor Herzl (1860–1904) ..... *Frontispiece*
Moses Hess (1812–1875)..... *facing page* 36
Leo Pinsker (1821–1891)..... " " 66
The Second Congress, Basel, August 28–31,
1898..... *following* " 92
Medal Struck in Honor of the Second Congress, *facing* " 124
Certificate of an Inscription in the Golden
Book of the Jewish National Fund..... " " 156
Six Stamps of the Jewish National Fund..... " " 188

FOREWORD

It was with much pleasure that I accepted the mandate, offered to me by The Jewish Publication Society of America, to contribute an essay on Zionism as one of a series dealing with prominent Jewish movements. Whichever side of the question appeals to us, we must all recognize that under the name Zionism a solution of the Jewish problem has been presented which must be of much moment for the future of the Jewish people. I venture to think that it is the only solution and to hold that the weal or woe of our race depends upon our espousal or rejection of it. In saying so much, I am practically affirming my standpoint. I make no excuse for the trend of my thought. I have written frankly as a Zionist, and I believe that the Publication Society and its many members will be served best by the presentation of all such subjects at the hand of those whose sympathy for them has made them able to understand their essence. Above all, I have been mindful of the advice given by the

philosopher on the throne of the Caesars, "Let there be in your speech an accent of heroic truth."

It is sometimes held that an historian must be unbiased, and must stand vis-à-vis to his subject much as a physician does to his patient. Such detachment may be valuable for a mere chronicler, to whom dry dates and lifeless facts are all-important. But a people has a soul, just as individual human beings have. To understand that soul, something more is needed than mere dates and facts. If evolution is creative, as Monsieur Bergson holds, the attempt must be made to understand in what that creative spirit consists, and this can be attained only by active sympathy with the peculiar phase of the soul-life the historian has to depict. This need not prevent him from taking a broad view of the opinion of others who do not see the light in exactly the same fashion. I have tried to do justice to the opposing view, and, if I have not succeeded, the shortcoming is excusable from the earnestness with which the problem appeals to me. The reader will make his own deduction on that score.

I have omitted many minor details—small differences of opinion that loomed large at certain times and became subjects of heated discussion—in

order to lay stress upon what seemed to me to be the leading lines of development. I have also respected confidences, due to my intimate relations with most of the leaders, which might discover motives or place certain facts in a clearer light. The time has not yet come for disclosing the inner history of many of the negotiations to which reference is made in the following pages.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK,
October, 1912.

CHAPTER I

THE PRE-HERZLITES

In commenting upon a passage in the Book of Psalms—so the Talmud relates[1]—two rabbis expressed opposing views. One held that "the time is adapted to the leader"; the other, that "the leader is adapted to the time." As is so often the case when views diverge, both phrases "are expressions of eternal truth." To very few men has it been given to be far ahead of the forces they were leading. Such a faculty has been reserved for the thinker and the seer, for the more poetic nature, which can set itself above the demands of practical life and measurable possibilities and soar into the refined atmosphere of pure thought.

Theodor Herzl was not originally a man of action. A poet, a writer, a dreamer in the best sense of that term, he would seem to have been fitted poorly by his early life, his education, his associations for the rôle he was called upon to play. Yet the circumstances in which the Jewish people were placed and the various converging currents of

thought were such as to force him to the leadership of a people at a most critical period of its history. Since 1896 sixteen years have gone by. Some of the acuter controversies raised by the appearance of Zionism have passed away. As opposition has become less marked, and the dire results presaged have not ensued, so also a certain inner evolution has taken place within the movement itself. The fundamental principles upon which the whole organization rests have indeed remained intact and inviolate, but it was inevitable that the direction of its conscious effort should change as the circumstances changed in which it worked. Perhaps the moment has come when an estimate can be made of the part played by Zionism in modern Jewish life, of the clearer perception of Jewish problems which it has induced, and of the contribution it has made towards a possible solution of some at least of these problems. With this purpose in view, the following pages have been written.

I have taken the year 1896 as the starting-point, not because historical movements of great moment can be fixed within definite limits of time, but because that date affords a convenient point of vantage from which to look both backward and forward: backward, because it is necessary to see how "the

time was adapted to the leader "; forward, in order to measure the degree in which "the leader was adapted to the time."

One need not be biased towards any of the existing expressions of Jewish feeling and thought to say that to none of them could the situation have appealed as satisfactory in itself or as promising in the hope that it held out for the future. Western Jewry, and by that I mean the Jews who had been born and reared in contact with the more advanced civilization of Central and Western Europe and of the United States, had staked its all upon the political emancipation for which it had fought with such tenacity and with such eminent success. It is true that there were many inner conflicts within that Jewry, but the larger mass of the Jews had been content to leave such matters for discussion among the learned and the religious leaders. The great ideals enounced by the prophets of old had found an echo in the highest aspirations of some of the leading thinkers and statesmen of the century. The Jews, born optimists as they are, eagerly followed a lead that spoke in language to which they and their forebears had been well accustomed. As the walls of the physical and constitutional Ghettos were razed one by one, the Western Jews felt that

at last they had come into their heritage, that they could take their place by the side of their non-Jewish fellow-citizens, and that both would move forward and on to a higher level, leaving behind them all the controversies and the struggles of the past as unpleasant reminiscences of a time that was gone forever.

It is quite certain that the Jewish Reformers and their followers were absolutely sincere in their theories and in their actions. They met the demands of the newly-created situation with characteristic energy. They were not merely shouting the language of patriotism. They knew that the enjoyment of new rights carried with it the obligation of new duties; they had to fit Jewish thought and Jewish observance into the new grooves in which their lives and the lives of their children were to run. Above all, they wished to save the Jewish religion, even at the expense of nationality and race, not realizing that the two last were the chief bulwarks of the religion. They commenced to doff the Jewish gabardine, to shuffle off ways, habits, and observances that seemed to run counter to the forms of modern conditions. For them, in very truth, the "East was the East and the West was the West." They felt that they must do their share

in the tacit understanding they had come to with what they called the "modern spirit."

It is not difficult to sympathize with the Reformers in their attempt to save Judaism. This was the kernel, for which rites, ceremonies, and observances made up the husk. Nor did they imagine that the kernel could continue and be shorn of its husk. But they did think that the husk was unnecessarily thick; even that its whole character could be changed and still remain the husk of that particular kernel. In point of fact, a good part of the husk had commenced to be withered and blighted. Various forms had died a natural death and had fallen by the wayside. Jews everywhere had bridled at some of the ancient customs, and had silently sunk them into oblivion. But no official action had been taken. Very few of the changes that occurred in ritual matters during the Middle Ages had been made consciously or with deliberation. They had been accepted *de facto* and *post eventum*. Least of all had such action been taken in matters of belief or theory. But it had always been a Jewish postulate that religion and life were intimately bound up one with the other. The first to break the rivet had been Moses Mendelssohn, the Berlin sage.[3] He had laid entire stress upon one side,

Jewish life, and had allowed individual belief to range as wide as possible. "The Spirit of Judaism is freedom in doctrine and conformity in action." But absolute conformity in action, both as regards the individual and his neighbor and as regards the present and the past, being impossible, the result was inevitable. Jewish life became atrophied, and Jewish belief, having no hold and no stability, soon lost all distinctive character. The descendants of the Mendelssohnian group have very largely passed out of Jewry.

The German Reformers chose the other way to break through the attachment. They laid great stress upon Jewish belief, upon the religious side. Jewish life as such did not appeal to them with much force, and, freed from what they considered the "trammels" of Jewish observance, Jewish belief became in time watered into a thinly-veiled theism. The most serious renunciation was that connected with the great hope of Israel's restoration, the pivot on which Jewish spiritual life revolved. The Jewish world had until then believed that the dispersion was a punishment. To the Reformers it became a blessing. Dispersion should be encouraged, "so that there might be worshipers of the one only and true God everywhere."[2] The

loss of Palestine signified progress, since Israel's ideals were carried into all lands. In conformity with these views, the Frankfort Rabbinical Conference of 1845 voted that "all petitions for the return to the land of our fathers, and for the restoration of a Jewish state, should be eliminated from the prayers."[4]

That the Reform movement has not fulfilled its undertaking, and that the Reformers were mistaken in part of the theory on which they worked, must not be laid to their discredit. They could not foresee the general trend of the world's thought and aspiration; they could not presage the effect of the new orientation upon their own descendants; and, above all, they could not measure the influence the masses of Eastern Europe were to exercise in international Jewry, when once their weight was put in the balance.

At various times in the history of Europe, the principles of internationalism and of national particularism have fought for predominance. In the Middle Ages the Church dreamed of a universal Christian community, divided into nationalities it is true, but all under the sway of the acknowledged head of the Roman Church. Such dreams were rudely shattered by the inner development of the

Church itself, by the resurrection of Paganism or of pagan ideals at the time of the Renaissance, and by the growth of national sentiments that refused to submit even to spiritual domination. Again, at the extreme end of the Middle Ages, a movement towards internationalism was distinctly apparent, led by the encyclopedists and deists of France, and fed by the growth of the natural sciences and the discoveries in the domain of exact knowledge. This was soon followed, however, by a reversal in which old races revived the consciousness of their separate existence, and new national segregations were formed, which tended to develop diversity in place of unison. The first of such transformations may be seen in the rebirth of the German Empire, in the forward movement of the Slavs, and in the growth of the smaller Balkan states; the second, in the vast growth of the United States and of Canada in the northern half of the new world and of the newer republics in its southern half.

Amid such varying developments, the Jewish people occupied a peculiar, not to say dangerous, position. Even in the Roman state, tolerant as it was of alien faiths, existence was always fraught with some danger to the Jews. Exceptional laws were passed in their favor, but just because of these

laws and because of their refusal to enter the melting-pot in which nationalities and races were fused, the Jews were liable at any moment to feel the pressure of exceptional treatment when Roman overlordship was felt to be in danger.[8] And, after all, even in the Roman Empire citizenship was bound up with religion. However syncretistic that religion might be, it was Roman and not Judaic.[9] In the evolution of a universal Christian community the Jews manifestly could have no share. As both the motives and the objects of this evolution were religious, no proper place could be found for them. All the legislation of the Middle Ages in regard to the Jews turns about the endeavor to make some provision for a people who had been omitted in the scheme according to which the statehood of the day was built up. Again, both the Reformation and the Renaissance were inner Christian movements. The revolt from Rome, as far as it affected the Jews, was a revolt from a religious and a secular tyranny, and what resulted was a tyranny that was religious only. Protestantism did little better than Roman Catholicism; it could not assimilate the Jews upon the only terms possible for the latter. They remained, no longer a proscribed people, one that was merely tolerated.

Had the universalistic and international tendencies of the early part of the nineteenth century persisted, the Jews would undoubtedly have found their place as one of the many forces working towards that end. It is interesting to note that Jews have not been backward in furthering movements of a universalistic character. The founders of Socialism were Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle; the inventor of a universal language was Lazarus Ludwig Zamenhof;[8] the projector of the Universal Race Congress was Felix Adler. With equal ardor, the Jews threw themselves into the national movement of the peoples among whom they dwelt. Not only did they wish to justify the granting of equal rights; in some countries their stake was deeper down in the ground than that of many of their co-citizens, and it had been there for a much longer period. Their patriotism was quite whole-souled. Unfortunately, the nationalist bias in Europe tended towards chauvinism, and chauvinism led to a narrowing of the wider outlook. Church and Society joined hands, and once more there was no place for the Jews, who held with tenacity to their separate existence and refused to lose their existence. In this way the ground was prepared in which Bismarck, for political reasons,

laid the seed of the modern anti-Semitic movement, which wrought so much havoc in Germany and in France, and which, in passing over to less cultured nations, produced veritable cataclysms among the Jews of Russia, Roumania, and Galicia.

How was the new danger of anti-Semitism to be met? Some of the better elements in German Christian society thought that a league against anti-Semitism would be efficacious, and founded the Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus. Among the Jews, many were of opinion that if they dropped all customs that render them distinct as a community and all forms that differentiate Jewish public worship from that of the Christian Church, the foundations of anti-Semitism would be destroyed. In the same spirit, Salomon Reinach argues that the Jewish proletariat will have more success in economic competition, if Jewish law is so amended as to permit the Jews to violate the Sabbath and to eat pork.[9] Just as Reinach forgot that such a course, quite apart from all higher considerations, would only increase competition, the ultra-Reform Jews erred in thinking that anti-Semitism was based upon theoretical considerations, and arguments could avail where passion was the moving

spirit. The genuinely Jewish answer to anti-Semitism was yet to be given!

The effect upon the Jews themselves of these changes in orientation was formidable. The passage from the Jewish Middle Ages, later in point of time than the general European, to the modern period was naturally fraught with much difficulty. It meant a wrench with the past which was so momentous in many cases as to disorganize families and communities. Here and there excessive zeal in modernizing led to deplorable results, and weakened the foundations upon which Jewish cohesiveness was based. Concessions are necessary on the part of every unit in a state organization: ideas change with increasing knowledge. But the smaller unit must always consider the length to which it may go in making such concessions and the point at which concession loses all its grace and becomes an ungainly rush towards complete self-obliteration.[10] Perhaps the most serious objection that can be raised to some of the later developments of the Reform movement is that they are destroying the unity that has hitherto prevailed in the corporate expression of Jewish practice and of Jewish hope. Violent changes have been made in the ritual, and the Jewish perspective has been remodeled in such manner

as to make the remodeling a renunciation. The one was apt to make the Jew a stranger among his brethren in many countries, the other to remove the fixed point in the future towards which all Jewish endeavor pointed and converged. For, as surely as the old Hebrew prophets had a wide outlook embracing more than simply Jewish interests, so surely was this outlook centered upon Judea and upon the return of the Jews to some form of a reconstructed common existence.[11] A people that has no common physical center and not even a spiritual one is dependent upon its common outlook to hold it together and direct its efforts to some concerted end. This once removed, disintegration is bound to set in.

In this respect, a study of ancient Judaism in its relation to Hellenism is most instructive. No movement with which the Jews have come in contact was so persuasive in its attraction and so seductive as Hellenism. It came to the Jews as the representative and symbol of culture and of art. It contained no political element, as did later Roman culture. It was quite adaptable to varying and differing civilizations; its ideals insinuated themselves among men and peoples. Had it not been for the national ideals that animated the Jews

in Palestine, they might have gone the way of their brethren in Egypt, or have descended to a compromise which would eventually have produced some form of hybrid civilization, like that of pagan Syria. Despite all their Hellenizing, the Jews in the Diaspora looked upon the city in which they dwelt as *patris* (native city), but upon Jerusalem as *metropolis* (mother-city, home).[12]

On the other hand, an unvarying persistence in stereotyped formulae and an unmodified observance are bound to get out of joint with the times. If the Reform movement has weakened the supports of traditional Judaism, and has facilitated egress from the community, certain forms of unbending Orthodoxy have allowed dry-rot and putrefaction to enter into those supports, and have contributed to the alienation of large numbers of the younger element, whose Jewish feeling failed to find expression in the older manner. The result has been a decided weakening of staying force and a capitulation, on a somewhat large scale, to the iniquitous demands made by social and bureaucratic anti-Semitism, especially in such countries as Germany and Austria.[13]

A new chapter in the history of modern Judaism has been written by the forced exodus of large

numbers of Jews from Eastern Europe. As the sad human stream is still flowing, it is too early to gauge its full effect upon their brethren in Western Europe and in America. But even now it is easy to see that this effect must be deep and far-reaching. Forced by circumstances, the Jews of Eastern Europe had lived more secluded from the outside world than those of the West. Segregated in this manner, they had been able to preserve intact more of the forms of Jewish life and to maintain an intenser Jewish spirit than had been possible where contact with other ideals and the demands of more expanded social relations had drawn the Jews into other orbits. To them the Jewish question presented itself, not merely as a subject for individual speculation, but as a question of their collective life or death. The opposition against which they had to contend was not one of mere pin-pricks; it threatened their whole existence. They were thrown back upon their own resources, and strengthened in maintaining that which they felt instinctively was their sole hope of salvation. Into their newer exile they carried an intense Jewish spirit and a feeling of solidarity, which revived the waning spirit of Western Jewries.

In addition, the cry for help that went up from

the victims of a relentless persecution that refused to disarm, awoke a responsive note in all the various communities into which they came. The active work of making proper provision for the outcasts brought Eastern and Western Jewry into close contact. To many Western Jews it suggested for the first time the thought that, though amongst themselves there was to be found what they were pleased to consider the best product of the amalgam of Judaism and modern culture, the great mass of Jews lived elsewhere—in Eastern Europe; that the Jewish proletariat lived *there,* a proletariat that would outweigh themselves both numerically and Jewishly in any settlement of the Jewish question in which the Jews had a word to say. In short, the modern crusade waged against the Jews of Eastern Europe had the result that must attend all such crusades. Instead of hastening the disintegration and final disappearance of the Jews, which was its object, it retarded it. It introduced the Eastern Jews to their Western brethren: it drove them into each other's arms, so that a close bond of sympathy was established between two portions of a people that had been estranged for so long a time.

The Jews emigrating from Russia, however, carried with them into their new homes an ideal

that had been fostered by some of their most cherished leaders and widest-read writers—the ideal that has been called Jewish Nationalism. Much has been written to prove and to disprove the statement that the Jews are a "nation." In the last analysis, the dispute turns upon a definition of the term. The same is true of the word "race" and its relation to "nation." The question of the purity of the Jewish race, of the measure of intermixture it has suffered during its centuries of exile or before, does not concern us here at all. It may well be left, with other similar questions, to be determined by anthropologists. Race may or may not be conditioned by physical phenomena; but so much may be said: it is not due to the exertion of the human will acting as a free agency. It is different with "nation," which represents an ideal rather than a fact. Men band themselves together for the accomplishment and achievement of certain ideals. Whether they reach the end sought for or not, matters little. The heart of the business lies in the effort that is made. It is this common and concerted effort that binds men together: it is the ideal that animates them which makes of them a nation; it is the common past of weal or woe, the collective intuition of deeds done or of experiences passed

through; it is the combined outlook into the future. In other words, it is the common soul that segregates a nation and differentiates it from others.

It was in this sense that Perez Smolenskin understood the term Jewish Nationalism. Between the years 1869 and 1884, his fruitful pen labored without cessation to the quickening of the Jewish conscience in Russia. The very title of his chief work, *Am Olam* (*An Eternal People*), gives us the keynote of all his endeavor: an eternal people must keep an "eternal ideal" constantly in view. That ideal he finds expressed in the one word "Zion." Since the destruction of the Temple, it has represented the hopes of the Jewish people. It stands for the peculiar culture after which the Jews have striven; it connotes the Hebrew language, the use of which must be cultivated anew, as the expression of that ideal; and later in life it betokened to him the physical goal for which the Jews must strive in order to attempt the realization of the ideal. Here, for the first time in Russia, a view of Jewish nationalism was proclaimed that was civic and social, not religious. The old inherited Messianic doctrine had become secular and profane. As we shall see, Smolenskin was not alone in his leadership. Many choice spirits were

to gather around him and follow him, and they not only propagated the transformed doctrine among their brethren in Russia, but in the persons of many of the exiles from the Pale of Settlement sent it fructifying in the remotest corners of the Diaspora.

Though it received its most tangible expression among Russian Jews, it is wrong to suppose that this ideal of Jewish nationality was entirely strange to the West. This will not surprise any one who is familiar with Jewish thought and history. Ever since the Second Jewish Commonwealth received its death-blow at the hands of Rome, the Jews as a body have lived an anomalous life. Driven westward, not only by the general trend of civilization, but also by the special circumstances of their isolated existence, their religious and cultural ideals were so closely connected with Oriental thought, so clothed in Oriental forms, they could sing with their beloved poet Jehudah Halevi, אני במערב ולבי בקדם, "though I live in the West, my heart is in the East." It did not need the formalizing genius of a Maimonides to include the doctrine of the return to Palestine in the Jewish creed. It had always been part and parcel of the belief of the Jew, and had been expressed in countless sayings, prayers, and poems.[14] It is true that this return was looked upon,

not as a simple historic or human event, but as part of the divine scheme of governance. It was to be preceded by certain superhuman foreshadowings; it was to be made effective by some form of direct celestial intervention; and as distant as such intervention seemed to be, so remote was the contingency of the return. Any attempt to further that consummation by human beings and in a human fashion would, in such circumstances, have appeared to be blasphemy, an attempt at terrestrial interference with a divine process. In point of fact, such was the attitude adopted by the Synagogue towards any one presuming to guide the community eastward, unless, as in the case of Sabbataï Zebi, he was under superhuman conduct. But even among those Jews who had moved away from some of the traditional standards, the belief held its subconscious grasp, and with the advent of a more tangible view of cosmic development, it is natural that it took on a more human and terrestrial form.[15]

The most important of these Western pre-Herzlites was undoubtedly Moses Hess, one of the early German Socialist leaders and a propagator of Proudhon's anarchistic ideas. As early as 1840[16] and under the influence of the Damascus troubles, he had written these pregnant words, "We shall



MOSES HESS

always remain strangers among the nations; these, it is true, will grant us rights from feelings of humanity and justice; but they will never respect us so long as we place our great memories in the second rank, but in the first the principle, 'ubi bene, ibi patria.'" His great work *Rome and Ierusalem, the Latest National Question,* published in 1862, not only laid down the historic and economic bases of that which was not yet called Zionism, but also contained a complete plan for the colonization and rejuvenation of the Holy Land. With this latter we are not concerned; it was called forth by similar plans formulated by Kalischer, Gordon, and Guttmacher in Russia. But it is interesting to see the strength of Hess' Jewish consciousness. He, a German political writer and leader, went the length of advising his Jewish brethren to sacrifice even their much-prized emancipation, if emancipation should be found to be irreconcilable with Jewish nationality. For he held that it was impossible to eradicate the Jewish national consciousness, and the Jewish type was bound to persist.

Hess' words, ardent and thrilling though they were, found little echo among his German brethren.[17] As one of his critics said, "It is an old idea which, with its practical demands, has come too

early."[18] Upon one man, however, *Rome and Jerusalem* exercised a decided influence, the historian Heinrich Graetz. In an article entitled *Die Verjüngung des jüdischen Stammes* (*The Rejuvenescence of the Jewish Race*), published in 1864, he recognizes, as an historian should, the new force that was slowly making its way into Jewish life: "The Jewish race is approaching, and under our very eye, a rejuvenescence which would formerly not have been thought possible. The enemies of the Jews look upon it with implacable rage, the Jews of cosmopolitan tendency secretly shake their head, the followers of the letter of the law associate deceptive hopes with it—all are dumbfounded at its appearance." He goes on to compare this stirring of the dead bones with a similar agitation among the exiles in Babylon, and leaves his readers to draw their conclusion.[19]

It is true that in some of the proposals put forward the romantic and the fanciful outweighed all practical possibilities; but though the branches and the twigs reached far out into the realm of imagination, the roots were firmly grounded in facts and in a clear recognition of these facts. Even the somewhat grotesque plan of Mordecai Manuel Noah, to found a refuge for the Jews on Grand Island near

Buffalo, was built upon principles which have found acceptance in later days. He saw clearly the need for the Jews of some segregation, of a return to the cultivation of the soil; that though only a certain number of Jews could be benefited by a segregation, the whole Jewish race would profit by it; that it was necessary to cultivate the Hebrew language; and, finally, that his own scheme provided only for a half-way house to Palestine—very much in the sense in which the East African scheme was finally presented to the Zionist Congress.[20]

Nor were there wanting well-wishers of the Jewish cause among Christians, who, in different ways and from diverse motives, had arrived at conclusions similar to those of the pre-Herzlite Jewish nationalists. It is even said that Napoleon had some such project in mind, for he inserted in the Moniteur Universelle of 1799 a proclamation inviting the Jews of Asia and Africa to place themselves under his leadership for the purpose of re-establishing ancient Jerusalem.[21] It is possible that the romantic side of the idea appealed to him; perhaps it was only an attempt to win the Eastern Jews to his cause, as he was to win many of those in the West by calling the "Sanhedrin" together in Paris. It is asserted that at a later time Bismarck enter-

tained similar projects,[22] though the evidence is not at all clear on the subject. But that the re-establishment of the Jews in Palestine might become a matter of general European interest was not without its advocates during the first half of the nineteenth century. The French Jew Joseph Salvador, the historian of the Second Jewish Commonwealth and of the Pentateuchal Legislation, had publicly advocated the calling of a European Congress for the purpose of reinstating his people in their old home, an idea that is supposed to have fired the mind of Disraeli, who, in his novels *Tancred, Alroy,* and *Coningsby,* gives unwitting support to the theory by his insistence upon the value of racial endurance. In one passage he goes even beyond this, and speaks the language of the most modern of Zionists in the words he puts into the mouth of the high priest in addressing Alroy: "You ask me what I wish: my answer is, the Land of Promise. You ask me what I wish: my answer is, Jerusalem. You ask me what I wish: my answer is, the Temple, all we have forfeited, all we have yearned after, all for which we have fought, our beauteous country, our holy creed, our simple manners, and our ancient customs."[23] An Englishman, Hollingsworth by name, went still further.

In 1852 [24] he published a pamphlet wherein he advocated the establishment of a Jewish state, urging it as a matter of much moment to Great Britain, for the purpose of safeguarding the overland route to India.

It cannot be denied that sometimes other considerations formed an unwelcome background to similar proposals. In some quarters the solution of the question assumed a purely theological aspect, which required the return of the Jews to Palestine as the premonition of the second coming of Christ. The whole work of Laurence Oliphant, his practical procedure in Palestine, his own settlement near Haifa, was dominated and vitiated by such theories. It is evident that the Jews of the West could feel little sympathy for these schemes of salvation, based, as they were, upon Christological theorems. They naturally looked askance at their authors, though recognizing the perfect good faith of such real friends of Israel in Exile. Unfortunately, they closed their ears also to appeals made to them by other and quite disinterested Christian writers, in whose analysis of their ills theology played no part at all. I shall mention three in particular.

Among the plays written by that great French psychological dramatist Alexandre Dumas fils,

there is one entitled *La femme de Claude.* In this play a Jewish character, Daniel, represents devotion to race in contrast to the devotion to science of one of the principal characters, Claude. Daniel characterizes the hope animating him in regard to the future of his people in the following words:

> We have come to an epoch when each race has resolved to claim and to have as its own its soil, its home, its language, its temple. It is long enough since we Jews have been dispossessed of all that—we have been forced to insinuate ourselves into the interstices of the nations, and there we have taken up the interests of governments, of societies, of individuals. This is a great deal, yet it is not enough. People still believe that persecution has dispersed us; it has merely spread us over the world. . . . We do not want to be a group any more, we want to be a people, a nation. The ideal name does not suffice us; the fixed territorial fatherland is again necessary for us, and I go to seek it and to obtain there our legalized birth certificate.[25]

More practical and more definite, but with equal warmth, the Swiss Henry Dunant, the founder of the Red Cross and the inspirer of the Geneva Convention, tried, between the years 1863 and 1876, to awaken interest among the Jews for the colonization of Palestine. In vain he knocked at the doors of the Alliance Israélite in 1863; in vain he appealed to the Jews in Berlin in 1866, and finally to the Anglo-Jewish Association in London. He even

went to the length of founding an International Palestine Society, and in 1876 a Syrian and Palestinian Colonization Society.[25] The Jews of Western Europe were still wrapt up in the seeming security that complete legal emancipation had brought them. In a few years they were to be awakened with a rude hand and with a violent jar.

No Christian and perhaps no Jewish writer has struck the high note of pathos and enthusiasm as has George Eliot in her novel *Daniel Deronda* (1876). Into the mouth of one of her heroes, the representative of the new Judaic nationalism, she places words that show how deeply she had penetrated into the Jewish soul:

> When it is rational to say, "I know not my father or my mother; let my children be aliens unto me, that no prayer of mine may touch them," then will it be rational for the Jew to say, "I will seek to know no difference between me and the Gentile; I will not cherish the prophetic consciousness of our nationality." Let the Hebrew cease to be, and let all his memorials be antiquarian trifles, dead as the wall-paintings of a conjectured race. Yet let his child learn by rote the speech of the Greek, where he adjures his fellow-citizens by the bravery of those who fought foremost at Marathon; let him learn to say, That was noble in the Greek, that is the spirit of an immortal nation! But the Jew has no memories that bind him to action; let him laugh that his nation is degraded from a nation; let him hold the monuments of his law which carried within its frame the breath

of social justice, of charity, and of household sanctities; let him hold the energy of the prophets, the patient care of the masters, the fortitude of martyred generations, as mere stuff for a professorship. . . .

In the multitude of the ignorant on three continents who observe our rites and make the confession of Divine Unity, the soul of Judaism is not dead. Revive the organic center: let the unity of Israel which has made the growth and form of its religion be an outward reality. Looking forward to a land and a polity, our dispersed people in all the ends of the earth may share the dignity of a national life which has a voice among the peoples of the East and the West—which will plant the wisdom and skill of our race so that it may be, as of old, a medium of transmission and understanding. Let that come to pass, and the living warmth will spread to the weak extremities of Israel, and superstition will vanish, not in the lawlessness of the renegade, but in the illumination of great facts which widen feeling, and make all knowledge alive as the young offspring of beloved memories. . . .

There is a store of wisdom among us to found a new Jewish polity, grand, simple, just, like the old—a republic where there is equality of protection. . . . Then our race shall have an organic center, a heart and a brain to watch and guide and execute; the outraged Jew shall have a defense in the court of nations, as the outraged Englishman or American. And the world will gain as Israel gains. For there will be a community in the van of the East which carries the culture and the sympathies of every great nation in its bosom; and there will be a land set for a halting-place of enmities, a neutral ground for the East as Belgium is for the West. Difficulties? I know there are difficulties. But let

the spirit of sublime achievement move in the great among our people and the work will begin. . . .

Let the torch of visible community be lit! Let the reason of Israel disclose itself in a great outward deed, let there be another great migration, another choosing of Israel to be a nationality, whose members may still stretch to the ends of the earth, even as the sons of England and Germany, whom enterprise carries afar, but who still have a national hearth and a tribunal of national opinion. . . . Let the central fire be kindled again, and the light will reach afar. The degraded and scorned of our race will learn to think of their sacred land, not as a place for sacred beggary, to await death in loathsome idleness, but as a republic where the Jewish spirit manifests itself in a new order founded on the old, purified, enriched by the experience our greatest sons have gathered from the life of the ages. . . . The sons of Judah have to choose, that God may again choose them. The Messianic time is the time when Israel shall will the planting of the national ensign. . . . Let us help to will our own better future and the better future of the world—not renounce our higher gift, and say, "Let us be as if we were not among the populations," but choose our full heritage, claim the brotherhood of our nation, and carry it into a new brotherhood with the nations of the Gentiles. The vision is there: it will be fulfilled.[27]

Three years later, in an essay entitled *The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!*[28] George Eliot renewed her appeal to the Jewish people:

There is still a great function for the steadfastness of the Jew: not that he should shut out the utmost illumination which knowledge can throw on his national history, but that he should

cherish the store of inheritance which that history has left him. Every Jew should be conscious that he is one of a multitude possessing common objects of piety in the immortal achievements and immortal sorrows of ancestors who have transmitted to them a physical and mental type strong enough, eminent enough in faculties, pregnant enough with peculiar promise, to constitute a new, beneficent individuality among the nations, and, by confuting the traditions of scorn, nobly avenge the wrongs done to their Fathers.

It is surprising that this appeal failed to awaken much enthusiasm in the many Jewish readers of the novelist. The chord of passionate sentiment seemed to have been struck in vain; the time was not yet to mobilize the conscience of the Jewish people. In one or two cases, it is true, intellectual assent was given to the theory developed in *Daniel Deronda.* A noted English Review had this to say at the hand of a Jewish reviewer:[29] "And Mordecai's views of the resumption of the soil of the Holy Land by the holy people are the only logical position of a Jew who desires that the long travail of the ages shall not end in the total disappearance of the race." And a German Jewish scholar of the highest repute wrote:[30] "All these objections [that Israel's final mission is to be found in the dispersion] do not touch this work of art; if we look closely, not even its central idea. For the establishment of a political

center is not intended to prevent the spread of the Jewish people on the earth, but rather to elevate and support the actions of the dispersed people, so that they become conscious of belonging to a unified and acknowledged community."

The new life that was fermenting Russian Jewry had not yet reached the West. Even the great exodus that commenced in 1882 did not confound the prophets of peace; the hands of Jewish men and women were filled with the immediate work of the hour, and few had the opportunity—if they had the desire—to project relief on large and noble lines.[31]

[Notes, pp. 217-220]

CHAPTER II

THE COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE

One of the consequences of the new interest shown among the Jews of Russia in the larger aspect of the Jewish question, and at the same time its most valuable fomenter and fosterer, was the attempt made to resettle the Promised Land. This movement Palestinewards had its recrudescence at the very moment when the more theoretic solution proposed for the alleviation of the ills from which the Jews were suffering was engaging the mind and the heart of those of them settled in the East End of Europe. It thus fell upon fruitful ground; the theoretic and the practical met in one common effort.

All through the Middle Ages communities of Jews had lived in various parts of Palestine, making a brave fight against political and economic odds, which, from time to time, threatened to become too strong for resistance. The varying vicissitudes of the country's history had prevented any concerted action on their own part. They had been equally miserable under Arab, Christian, and Turkish dominion, and yet they had persisted. Ever and

anon their numbers had been increased by individual and collective additions, most notably from Russia and Galicia. They had settled chiefly in Jerusalem and in one or two cities of Galilee, such as Safed and Tiberias, where Cabalistic activity had formed an additional magnet. The connection of these communities with those of their brethren in other lands had not been intimate, and had been preserved largely by the collectors of alms who gathered, in Europe and later in America also, sustenance for the Talmudic and Cabalistic schools in Palestine. Two events were destined to work a change in these relations.

In the year 1840 a Capuchin friar in Damascus, Father Thomas, disappeared. At the instigation of an Italian, Ratti Menton, who had been appointed French consul, the blame for his disappearance was laid upon the Jews, and a case of "ritual murder" was made out. In conjunction with the Catholic clergy, the instigators were successful; many Jews were tortured and imprisoned, some even meeting their death. The tale of woe reached Europe, led to many meetings of protest, and induced Sir Moses Montefiore, Adolphe Crémieux, and Salomon Munk to journey to Mehemet Ali of Egypt, under whose power Syria at that time was

governed, and to obtain redress from him. It was at Damascus that these public-spirited men first became acquainted with their Eastern brethren, and saw the real tale of their suffering.

Twenty years later, in 1860, Damascus was once again to focus the attention of Europe. The Druses in the neighborhood of the city had fallen upon their ancient enemies, the Maronite Christians, had massacred many, and had pillaged their dwellings. The Jews were again falsely implicated in these troubles.

The attention of the world being in this manner directed towards Palestine and Syria, the Jews in Europe began to see the duty that lay upon them in connection with their brethren in the nearer East and to feel the bond that had held so loosely in times gone by. This new interest in Palestine is connected with the names of three men, Albert Cohn, Charles Netter, and Sir Moses Montefiore. That their interest was more than merely eleemosynary can fairly be deduced from the utterances and writings of the first two, who, in conjunction with Adolphe Crémieux, later a Minister of Justice in the French Cabinet of 1870, became the chief founders of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in 1860. Salomon Munk had as early as 1840 expressed the wish,

"Would that the sad Damascus incident might at least serve to make us take cognizance of our disorganized condition, which, though mournful to contemplate, is unfortunately a fact."[1] In view of later developments in the conduct of the Alliance and of the distinctly anti-national tendencies induced by it, it is interesting to note that its founders at least were animated by a different spirit. Its very name "Universelle" is warranty sufficient that its outlook was wide and transcended the somewhat narrow horizon of the French Jews. Indeed, the founders had based their action upon a sentiment expressed in the following words: "All other important faiths are represented in the world by nations; that is to say, they are incarnated in governments especially interested in them and officially authorized to represent them and speak for them alone. Our faith alone lacks this important advantage; it is represented neither by a state nor by a society, nor does it occupy a clearly defined territory."[2] In his report on the Mikweh Israel Agricultural School near Jaffa, Charles Netter, its real founder, wrote to the Central Committee of the Alliance at Paris:

You are preparing an asylum for whole populations, who perhaps to-morrow will be forced to flee *en masse* because of the

fanaticism of the Greek victorious over the crescent. . . . You will accomplish the pacific conquest of this sacred land where—neither Orthodox nor Reformer has forgotten it—the Supreme Being was invoked by our fathers, while the rest of the world was plunged in paganism. . . . In this wise you will gain the Holy Land. The magnitude of the task need not frighten you. That which appears to be a revery to-day may to-morrow become a reality.[3]

There were further tokens that even in very Orthodox circles a new conception of the rôle Palestine was to play in the future had gradually asserted itself, that the hand of man was necessary for the proper achievement of the purposes of Providence. In a letter to Albert Cohn, Samuel David Luzzatto of Padua, the learned scholar, critic, and writer, wrote in 1854, "Palestine must be peopled by Jews and tilled by them, in order that it flourish economically and agriculturally, and take on beauty and glory." But perhaps no one insisted upon the changed outlook which circumstances had compelled as did Hirsch Kalischer, rabbi in Thorn, Prussia. The title of his work, *Emunah Yesharah,* published in 1860, shows that he is more concerned with religious dogmas than with the practical demands made by these dogmas. He concedes that a new interpretation must be given to the older ideas, that the divine purpose of the future in-

gathering of the Jews must come about in a natural way, and that the Messianic idea can become a fact only in the slow working of historic events. Kalischer's book is, in a measure, a complete break with the past; it represents a more human rendition of the old hope and promise, a change from the former policy of *laisser-aller* to one of positive action and forward help. The first step in that forward policy was to be the colonization of Palestine.

The ideas expressed by Kalischer in his *Emunah Yesharah,* and completed by more practical suggestions in a little pamphlet entitled *Derishat Ziyyon,* published in 1862, in which the definite founding of a society for the colonization of Palestine was proposed, were the first rays of the new light that penetrated from Eastern European to Western Jewry. Hess thankfully records the incitement he received from this Orthodox source; but while Hess based his argumentation upon social and economic considerations, Kalischer started from religious motives. It is evident that though Hess might appeal to the reasoned judgment of choicer spirits, Kalischer would have the ear of the multitude. It was through Kalischer, then, that both in Germany and in Russia a certain zeal was en-

gendered for that which, in later times, has been called " practical work " in Palestine.

In fact, it was Kalischer's written word that brought about the first attempt made by the Jews to redeem the Land of Promise. He was the inspirer of Charles Netter, under whose auspices the Alliance Israélite Universelle founded the Mikweh Israel Agricultural School referred to above. It was a strange irony of fate, still more pronounced when we remember that a position in connection with the school was offered to Kalischer, which, however, he was unable to accept. The school was intended to train scientific agriculturalists, who were to lay the foundations for future colonization. The institution, great in promise, has not played the part its founders laid out for it. The leaders that followed Netter and his co-founders in directing the policy of the Alliance gradually moved out of touch with the mainsprings of Jewish life. It is the merit of the Alliance that it was the first Jewish body to apply itself seriously to the education of the Jewish masses in the Orient, but in the course of time it turned its back upon the wider and higher aspirations of the Jewish people. The young men who proceeded from the school near Jaffa emigrated to Egypt, to the United States, to Canada: they have

been of little service to Palestine and to the Jewish cause there. Instead of producing agriculturalists, the school has trained up agronomic specialists, who naturally could find little field for their activity in a country so backward as Palestine.

Nor were the early attempts at actual colonization any more successful. It is true that a society for this purpose had been formed at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and that in the early "seventies" of the nineteenth century a settlement had been effected at Petah Tikwah near Jaffa, and again, by Kalischer himself, near the Sea of Tiberias. But they were sporadic and probably unintelligent experiments, valuable rather as indications of a real interest in the matter than as successful practical accomplishments.

As a concomitant of the revived national sentiment we must regard the awakened interest in the Hebrew language. It is wrong to suppose that Hebrew had ever become a dead language, in the full acceptation of that term. It is true that it was no longer used as the ordinary means of personal intercommunication; that in the countries of mid- and Western Europe and America its place had been usurped by the tongues of the various lands in which the Jews dwelt, and that in Eastern

Europe it had been superseded by the Judeo-German, or "Yiddish," a dialect based upon a substratum of Middle Age High German with a large admixture of Hebrew. But it had persisted as the official language of the Synagogue and as the means of literary intercourse among scholars. Its later development has, of course, been retarded by the fact that this development proceeded among writers and not among "livers." The Hebrew of the Italian school kept too rigidly to the forms and expressions found in the Hebrew of the Bible; that of the German Jews suffered from being too often a mere translation from the German; and that of the Russian Jews was largely newspaper-Hebrew, and, written in haste, was not over-scrupulous in its adherence to standards. The breath of real life was wanting.[4]

Now, language is one of the most potent spurs to national development. Our modern times have seen striking examples of the rejuvenation of languages supposed to be dead or cultivated merely for the purpose of learned examination. One recalls to mind the revival of Cymric in Wales, of Gaelic in Ireland, of Bulgarian in the Balkan peninsula. The first of these was to all appearance dead, and might have gone the way of its sister dialect in

Cornwall, but for the resolute attitude of a few energetic Welshmen, who have made it chief among the forces to save Welsh culture from shipwreck and annihilation. The resuscitation of Gaelic, we are told by unprejudiced observers, has done more for the betterment of conditions in Ireland than the speeches of a thousand agitators.[5] And the recrudescence of Bulgarian has proved a powerful weapon in the reconstruction of the Bulgarian state.

Hebrew, as a real living speech, had a harder battle to fight than any of these. The Jews who lived in scattered communities had naturally little use for a common language different from the one used by the people among whom they lived. Even in the synagogue service, the vernacular threatened to take the place of the sacred tongue. In the denser and larger agglomerations of Eastern Europe, Judeo-German had so completely asserted itself as to leave neither room nor time for the cultivation of Hebrew; while in the Semitic East the Spanish of Castile, brought thither by the exiles from the Iberian peninsula in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, acquired almost the same standing among the Sefardim that Judeo-German has among the Ashkenazim. Indeed, Judeo-German had so gained the ascendancy among its adepts,

and had produced so prolific a literature, that there was danger of its becoming a national tongue in its own turn; and the fact that Hebrew was the *lashon ha-kodesh,* "the holy tongue," predisposed a certain section of Orthodox Jews to look with scant affection upon its attempted use in the concerns of everyday life. This distaste was increased by the knowledge that some of the protagonists in the revival of Hebrew were not known for their adherence to Orthodox standards, and the movement was believed to lead away from an insistence upon these standards.

It is agreed that a common language is a necessity for the corporate existence of any body of men. Jewish tradition recognizes this. An ancient Midrash, recapitulating the merits of the Israelites in Egypt upon the basis of which they were found worthy of redemption by the Almighty, mentions as one of these merits the fact that "they had not forsaken their national speech."[6] Many of the new generation, who had been fired by the new national idea, eagerly took up the cultivation of the ancient tongue. Societies were established and text-books written for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of Hebrew by a more natural method than the one hitherto employed. But it was especially the

new interest in Palestine and the founding there of Jewish colonies that gave a strong fillip to the movement. Coming from various countries, the colonists found it necessary to develop a means of common intercourse. In addition to the sentimental considerations, which naturally served as an incentive,—the Jewish soil was so intimately connected with *the* language of the Jews,—practical motives made the demand imperative, especially in the field of education. The only modern schools to which the Jews of Palestine could send their children had been founded by Jewish societies in France, Austria, England, and Germany; and as these schools made the language of the country of their origin the vehicle of instruction, the children of one and the same family ran the risk of becoming polyglot collectively but individually strangers to each other. Only gradually, and after much insistence, did the idea make its way, that the only rational course to pursue was to take Hebrew for this purpose. And, in very truth, the Jewish schools in Palestine are becoming the training ground for the renaissance of Hebrew as a living tongue in the fullest sense of the term.

[Notes, pp. 220-221]

CHAPTER III

LEO PINSKER AND AUTOEMANCIPATION

The various influences which have been detailed were brought to a head by the anti-Semitic movement of 1881 and the following years. As we have seen, it struck at the most cherished acquisition of the Jews in Germany and Austria, the social position which they supposed had been conferred upon them by their emancipation. It is hardly to their blame that they imagined that the granting of rights would end the eighteen hundred years of martyrdom. Was it not an era of constitutions, of conferences, of formal paper agreements? Had not the Berlin Conference of 1878 secured equitable treatment for the Jews in the newly-formed Balkan states? However difficult the situation might be at times for the Jews in Central Europe, in Russia the difficulty became a tragedy. For, under a civilization that was both in form and in fact less advanced than the civilization of the rest of Europe, anti-Semitism developed into pogroms and into an economic oppression that drove hundreds of thou-

sands out of the country in search of new homes. No one can measure the sum of human misery that has been heaped up there consequent on the passing of the May Laws in 1881 and the administrative regulations that followed them, promiscuously but only too quickly. Nor was it different in Roumania. The paper-rights of the Jews there, forced upon the government in 1878, had remained—as they remain to this day—a dead letter. Thousands had been forced to quit the country, fleeing in despair to save the little life that had been left in them. To these two must be added Galicia, where Austrian anti-Semitism, with more refined methods, had instituted economic pogroms quite as effective as the physical ones in near-by Russia.

Of the various parties in Jewry who tried, by one means or another, to weather the storm that had broken in upon them, few understood its real significance, or saw that the real significance of the whole business lay in the fact that the present state of the Jews was more parlous than the past, in that the Jewish position had grown worse, while the world had progressed in its general ideas of intercommunal and international comity. Some of these few were to be found in Russia—men who, like M. L. Lilienblum, were keener-sighted and

longer-headed than their brethren, and who scented the danger in the air, and as early as 1870 sounded the alarm in the Jewish camp. Their words, however, fell upon barren ground, perhaps because they were alarmists and had no constructive policy to offer. It needed a practical lesson not only to teach them the truth, but to set them to thinking. In fact, they began to think furiously. The lesson came in the years of terror 1881 and 1882. Happily, in the advance guard stood a man like Leo Pinsker, a physician, who, towards the end of the year 1882, sent a warning note ringing through Russian Jewry, which is still heard by all those who seek a final healing of the old complaint.

Pinsker had grown up in the ideas prevalent during the mid-decades of the nineteenth century, and he believed, together with his fellow-intellectuals, that the ideas of world-wide cosmopolitanism and internationalism were the surest guarantees for the welfare of the Jews. From these reveries, as he himself relates, he was awakened rudely by the excesses of the early "eighties." He was an eye-witness of the havoc created by the May Laws of 1881. Although he was advanced in years, his soul was touched to the quick. Using an interval in the forward movement of the scourge, he sat down

to study, not only the pathology of his own and his brethren's status, but also the necessary therapeutics. Whether Pinsker was aware or not of the earlier attempt of Hess seems uncertain. Though his conclusions agree in the main with those of his predecessor, he formulates them with greater precision, but with no less warmth of feeling. The root of the evil from which the Jews are suffering he finds to be the fact that, since the destruction of Jerusalem, the various peoples and rulers have never had to deal with the Jews as a nation, but only with individual settlements of Jews. The blame for this lies primarily at the door of the Jews themselves. They have not only never felt the necessity for national concentration, but, on the contrary, have actively denied that necessity. The consequence has been that, having attempted to commit national suicide, they have been taken at their word, have been regarded as a dead nation—and treated as such. They have walked the earth as a ghost, and, as all ghosts do, have inspired fear and dislike. In addition, Jews have suffered from being strangers in a double sense: strangers in the lands to which they have been driven, and more than strangers because they had no land of their own in which they and others could feel that they were completely at

home. It is for this reason that emancipation in the eyes of the law has not carried with it the social emancipation for which the Jews had hoped. It is a duty which the Jews owe to themselves, to get rid of this alien condition, to find and to found a home in which their superfluous population in the various countries can be settled.

It is worthy of note that Pinsker breaks, in a measure, with the religious hope of the restoration as Judaism had always understood it. Such a home is to be sought, not necessarily in the Holy Land, but wherever a fitting soil can be found for the homeless people. He argues that it is the God-idea and the Bible that have made Palestine holy, not Jerusalem and not the Jordan, and these ideas can be carried by the Jews into any land in which they may settle. He is thus a territorialist long before the rise of the Ito movement; and as the Russian Jews were impregnated and fired by Pinsker's arguments, we can understand why they have greeted the latest movement with so much warmth.

In one word, it is self-emancipation that Pinsker preaches, as he calls it in the title of his work, *Autoemancipation.*[1] It is this that he considers to be the true answer to anti-Semitism.[2] But

Pinsker went further, and sketched in broad outline the means that were to be adopted to reach this end. His perspicacity and his clear vision are evident from the fact that, in a general way, the lines he foreshadowed, but was not destined to see realized, are those upon which later developments were to run. In one point, however, he was mistaken. He looked to the various Jewish "Alliances" to head such a movement, thinking, no doubt, of the Alliance Israélite, the Vienna Allianz, and the Anglo-Jewish Association of London, all three of which had been established, during the twenty years that preceded the first Russian pogroms, for the conservation and forwarding of general Jewish interests. He was spared the knowledge that these institutions proved to be among the most determined opponents of the ideas which he had set forth. As if he himself half suspected that his hopes in this regard might not be realized, he suggested that a sort of general board (Direktorium) should be formed, made up of men prominent in finance, science, and letters, in whose hand the leadership of the movement should be placed, though he failed to indicate in what manner and by what means the choice was to be made. In addition, a company was to be launched to care for the

financial side of the undertaking, the moneys for which were to be gotten partly from the sale of the lands acquired by the general board, partly from a national Jewish subscription, which Pinsker thought would be carried through upon a large scale.

I have mentioned these few details of the manner in which Pinsker imagined his scheme might be carried out, merely because they now seem almost prophetic in character. They have found expression in the Zionist Congress, in the Jewish Colonial Trust, and in the National Fund. Nor was he wanting in political foresight. Though he did not dwell on the subject, he saw clearly that any foregathering of Jews would be impossible unless it had at least the passive good-will of the political forces that control the fortunes of Europe. That he did not insist upon this point is no doubt due to the very modest program he had in mind. Nowhere in the pamphlet do we find the word "state" used. He speaks of a "home" and of a "colonist-community" (Kolonistengemeinwesen).

It is safe to say that many of the Jewish leaders in Russia at that time went through the same process of refinement as Pinsker. Moses Löb Lilienblum is another characteristic example. Born in 1843 in a village near Kovno, he had been drawn



LEO PINSKER

into the Haskalah movement. His personal emancipation from the confining boundaries of the Talmudic education, the only education possible for Jewish students in the Russia of his day, had led him far afield from the Jewish outlook, into a materialistic view of life, which threatened him for a time with intellectual shipwreck. A large soul, however, which could not remain insensible to the sufferings of his people, soon furnished the counterbalance. As early as 1876 he had publicly defended a project for buying Palestine from the Sultan—a project that had been advanced by a certain Hayyim Gedaliah. The persecutions of 1880 and 1881 opened his eyes to the real question that the Russian Jews had to solve, and, throwing aside all considerations for his future, he gave himself heart and soul to the new movement, Hibbat Ziyyon (Love of Zion). Pinsker's *Autoemancipation* made a great impression upon him. He became secretary of the society of which Pinsker was the inspiration and the head, and in his *Return of the Exiles* he has given us a history of the early years of the society's work.

The passage of so many of his brethren from Russia to America set Lilienblum thinking. He could see no real salvation in this exodus *en masse*.

Though liberal America might offer very many more advantages to the Jews than Russia ever could, the emigration was no real solution of the Jewish question. It tended merely to create a Jewish question in another country. It was with this idea in mind that in 1883 he published his *Rebirth of the Jewish People in the Holy Land of Their Ancestors.* His political insight was, of course, not deep; his chief concern was to see as many Jews as possible settle in Palestine, with no thought as to their preparedness for the work there or the readiness of the land to receive them. We are, therefore, not concerned with the practical measures which he suggests for colonization, but rather with the central idea, that, as the Jews are everywhere considered to be strangers, a common existence with the native element in the various countries of the Exile is impossible, and therefore a national home is an imperious necessity.[3]

Ideas similar to those of Lilienblum were set forth by O. L. Levanda. After a long period of literary activity, in which he had preached the transformation of the Russian Jew into the Russian citizen, in much the same manner as Jewish leaders in Western Europe had done for their own followers, he came to the conclusion that this step

forward in state-citizenship carried with it irresistibly a diminution of Jewish sentiment. He is the first perhaps to use the word " assimilation "—about which so much ink was to be spilled later on—and to make it clear that assimilation, to be really effective, must proceed from the larger body in which the smaller one is placed. To Levanda, the root of Jewish misery lies in the fact—misconceived alike by Jews and by non-Jews—that the real opponents of assimilation are the various nations among whom the Jews live, who have no love for union with them. The distaste for union does not come from the Jews.

It is perhaps remarkable that this whole movement, which had stirred so deeply the Jews of Russia, failed to find a resonant echo in Western Europe. If one excepts Doctor Rülf in Memel, one looks in vain for an intelligent appreciation of the ideas that were slowly transforming the Jewish masses in Eastern Europe. It is probably due to the ignorance of Russo-Jewish matters shown even by those in the West who were supposed to be students of contemporary Jewish life. Besides, many of the articles by Lilienblum, Levanda, and others were written either in Russian or in Judeo-German, and were not likely to fall into the hands

of Western publicists or to be read by them. But Doctor Rülf was situated in the northernmost corner of Prussia, a stone's throw from the Russian frontier. Memel had been a center of distribution when the Russo-Jewish exodus was at its height. Rülf had witnessed the tragedy at his very door, and Pinsker's work reached him at a psychological moment, when his Western training was suffering from the severe shock it had received by a return to medieval barbarism. Rülf's *Arukat Bat Ammi* (*The Healing of My People*) is not remarkable for the closeness of its logical argumentation, but rather for the warm feeling and lofty idealism that pervade it. Avowedly written under the influence of Pinsker's *Autoemancipation,* it formed in a measure a stepping-stone over which some ideas of the Russian leaders passed into Central Europe.

Only some of them. Jewish nationalism had little attraction for the Jewish denizens of the rest of Europe. Having been emancipated before the secular law, most of them were concerned in emancipating themselves from Jewish law, or, where this was not sufficient, in proving their right to the new status by a complete abandonment of the old. It was only in certain Orthodox circles, notably in Frankfort-on-the-Main and Berlin, that one side of

the Russian movement received sympathetic furtherance, the side connected with the colonization of Palestine. Now, the idea of *Yishub Erez Yisraël* (The Resettlement of the Land of Israel) was so closely associated with Orthodox tenets that it may well be said to be a part of the silent creed that usually goes hand in hand with official and doctrinal presentment of the principles of a religion.[4] The furtherance of Jewish colonization in the Holy Land could not well be neglected by those who held that Jewish "custom" (minhag) when followed for a length of time became invested with a religious significance and developed into a "commandment" (mizwah). Many a conscientious Jew salved his conscience by accepting this part of the new program, while resolutely denying the validity of the rest.

But even in Russia itself the echo of Doctor Pinsker's piercing cry was faint. There were leaders sufficient in whom the larger spirit moved, but there were few regulars to assist in carrying out the lofty ideas of the leaders, which were only dimly understood by the people at large. It was but natural. A broad view demands a position of vantage from which it can be taken. The life of the Jews in Russia was too circumscribed and too

cramped to afford them an opportunity to rise to such a position. It is, therefore, greatly to Doctor Pinsker's credit that, being unable to achieve the full measure of his purpose, he was content to accept less and to become the head of the Chovevi Zion (Hobebe Ziyyon). This movement, which had Odessa for its center, sought to give tangible expression to the newly-awakened interest in Palestine. Its ramifications reached out into other parts of the Diaspora, notably into Roumania, where it received active support from such men as Doctor K. Lippe and L. Pineles. From Russia it spread to Austria, Germany, England, and the United States. Some of its daughter-societies were the Kadimah in Vienna, the Ezra in Berlin, and the Bnei Zion associations in English-speaking countries. Indeed, in 1890 the attempt was made to weld the societies together into an organic whole by the formation of a Central Committee in Paris, under the direction of Doctor Haffkine and M. Myerson. Had it been possible to inform the movement with the larger ideas of Pinsker and some of his immediate associates, a world-wide Jewish movement might have resulted from the Chovevi Zion. But the Odessa Committee retained its preponderating influence, and despite the excellent work it has

done in assisting colonization and furthering the dissemination of culture among the Jews of Palestine, it has, like the Alliance Israélite Universelle, failed to utilize the rare opportunity it had of making its program large, bold, and statesmanlike. And when Zionism started to occupy the position the Chovevi Zion societies should have taken, there was noticeable discord between the two parties, and the debate was carried on with much sound and fury. It is true that the London body accepted the Zionist platform in 1898, and the Odessa Committee, in 1906, acquiesced in the resolutions adopted by the Seventh Congress. Nevertheless, Hibbat Ziyyon has remained, with its incomplete policy, the program of many Russian Zionists and of some friends of the movement in the West. The Chovevi Zionists must be regarded as spade-workers in a cause greater than they themselves imagined; for without the primal interest in Palestine which they generated and centralized in Russia, it would have been difficult for Herzlian Zionism to penetrate there.[5]

I have said that Pinsker was willing to accept less than he asked for rather than receive nothing. Among the Jewish apostles at that time there was one, however, who refused to serve permanent

interests by opening the door to passing moods. Pinsker was nearing the end of his life when Asher Ginzberg came to Odessa. I shall have something to say later on in regard to Ginzberg's literary work as a student of Jewish history. He recognized at once how pusillanimous and mediocre was the spirit that informed the Chovevi Zion as he found it in 1889. Envisaging the Jewish problem in its totality, the calamitous destiny that seemed to hang over his brethren in Russia, Ahad ha-Am (to use his pen-name) sought to infuse new life into the Chovevi Zion, to interject a wider and deeper interpretation into the old Hibbat Ziyyon. In an article published in Ha-Meliz, entitled *Lo zeh ha-Derek* (*Not This Is the Way*) he tried to discover for his readers in what manner the movement Zionwards had failed to grasp the real significance of the problem it had started out to solve. In a subsequent number of the same paper, he published a positive program, which he entitled, very characteristically, *Derek ha-Hayyim* (*The Way of Life*). In this pronouncement, Ahad ha-Am pleads for a more spiritual conception of Hibbat Ziyyon, which shall busy itself not only with the attainment of a certain goal, but also with the preparation of the Jewish people to be worthy of that

goal. He suggests an association of the men of this true nationalist persuasion, who are to be "an inspiration to each other and a help in communicating their own feelings to the people," so that perhaps "in the course of days and years they may succeed in infusing their spirit into the people at large and in restoring those moral qualities to it without which a people cannot exist as such. Such a society ought to be quite untrammeled in its activities; it should not regard numbers as essential, but quality."

It will be seen that what Ahad ha-Am was searching for was a breeding-place for leaders, where in company with others of like tendency that moral and spiritual strength might be developed which he wished to breathe into the whole Chovevi Zion movement. A chosen few gathered around the author of the *Way of Life,* but though lishkot, or lodges, were formed in many Russian cities, and though adherents were gained in some of the larger cities of mid-Europe, the number of actual members was never much above one hundred and fifty. And it was not merely fortuitous that this little band took the title Bene Mosheh (Sons of Moses); for to Ahad ha-Am Moses was the protagonist of the highest prophetical outlook developed in the Bible

—the man of truth, the extremist, the example of righteousness in word and action.[7] Jewish nationalism was to embody these great qualities of the prophet.

The Bene Mosheh failed of its greater promise. It remained a small group, whose members were not of the necessary caliber to penetrate the whole of the Chovevi Zion movement with their influence, much less to mobilize the conscience of the Jewish people and produce that "vitalized generation" which Ahad ha-Am demanded. Yet, during the short period of its existence, it is said that there proceeded out of the midst of that circle certain influences that founded a number of institutions which are among the best of the moving forces in Palestine Jewry to-day: the colony Rehobot, the Carmel Wine Company, the publication society Ahiasaf, and the Hebrew magazine Ha-Shiloah.[8]

It was in the year 1874 that the first attempt was made to found a Jewish agricultural colony in Palestine; some Jews from Jerusalem laid the first stones of Petah Tikwah (=Melebbes). The second dates from 1882, when immigrants from Russia and Roumania settled at Rishon le-Ziyyon and Wadi el-Hanin (=Nes Ziyyona) in Judea, Rosh Pinnah in Galilee, and Zikron Yaäkob in

Samaria. The real impetus to these attempts belongs to the Chovevi Zion. It has often been said that the history of these early foundations is an extremely sorry one and not auspicious for their future prosperity.[8] The fact is undeniable. Most of the new colonists suffered dire necessity, and must have found it difficult to decide whether their present situation was any better than that which had preceded it. Yet it is characteristic of the high purpose and the incurable optimism that animated these pioneers that few of them longed for the fleshpots of Europe, and that, in spite of almost insuperable difficulties, they kept manfully to the task they had set for themselves.

But in nothing perhaps is the disorganization of Jewry at that time so evident as in the manner in which the whole movement was begun and carried forward. East and West faced each other, if not as opposing forces, at least as brothers who were at the same time strangers. The Eastern leaders were not men of the world, but denizens of the study, students and university graduates. Those of the West were indeed men of the world, but they had not the same Jewish feeling possessed by their brethren in the East. It was not merely the eternal conflict between the practical and the ideal

that seems to have vitiated the whole Chovevi Zion movement; it was a sort of inner contradiction among the members themselves. The Russian leaders were animated by a strong national sentiment, which was the incentive and the background for their interest in Palestine. Colonization in that country had a higher object for them than the possible solution of a present and very pressing crisis. Among the Jews in the West, most of those who threw in their lot with the Chovevi Zion felt convinced that religious considerations enjoined upon them the furtherance of the movement, but refused to allow any considerations of a Jewish nationalist character to influence their action. And there was a third group, whose association with the work was purely philanthropic, who had as little sense for the religious preoccupations of their Orthodox brethren as they had for the more patriotic sentiments of the nationalists. It was fateful that just this latter class was bound to have a preponderating influence upon the course of events, because in its hands lay the means for any action on a large scale.

In the first category were the leaders of the Odessa Committee, Pinsker, Lilienblum, Rabbi Mohilever, Professor Shapira of Heidelberg, Professor Mandelstamm of Kiev, and S. P. Rabino-

witz; in the second the Ezra Verein of Berlin, with men like Doctor Hirsch Hildesheimer at the head; and in the third Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the Jewish Colonization Association, and the Alliance Israélite Universelle. The third class, it is true, never attached itself formally to the Chovevi Zion movement. It was through Chovevi Zionists that their aid for Palestinian colonization was secured. How was it possible for such disparate elements to combine in any common effort or to give proper and unified direction to so radical and novel a movement among the Jews? No organization existed to which the nationalists could turn and in which they could find their proper place. A leading mind was wanting that could effect such an organization within their own ranks. They were forced to ally themselves with the Chovevi Zion. But when Zionism with its larger outlook appeared, they immediately found their bearings and became its chief supporters.

The history of Jewish colonization in Palestine between the years 1882 and 1899 represents a further attempt at a solution of the Jewish question upon the old philanthropic basis. It was bound to prove abortive just because it was philanthropic. For to treat the needs of a whole people from so

narrow a standpoint was to measure a country with the tailor's yardstick. Had that philanthropy at least been informed by a higher ideal, it might have stood a chance of laying the foundation, if nothing more, for a greater effort. Philanthropy as a palliative for Jewish suffering has been tried so often during the centuries that have passed that its bankruptcy in Palestine was a conclusion almost foregone. A bureaucracy can move only upon narrow lines, and the bureaucracy of this epoch of Palestinian colonization was further vitiated by all the evil concomitants with what in practice was a species of absentee landlordism. That something was, in the end, saved from the wreck, and became the basis for a newer and more wholesome development, was due to the good sense of the chief absentee landlord and to the perseverance of the colonists themselves. Baron Edmond de Rothschild deserves all the credit and praise that has been meted out to him for having been sufficiently open-minded to recognize a fault, when it was called to his attention with no uncertain voice. He had spent a large sum of money in the founding and the upkeep of many of the Palestinian colonies; rumor fixes the sum as high as sixty or seventy millions of francs. It was no easy matter to disengage himself from the

responsibility this expenditure carried with it. But in the year 1899 he handed over whatever interest he still had in the colonies to the Jewish Colonization Association.

The change was perhaps for the worse. It rendered the bureaucracy still more bureaucratic, and the absentee landlordism more pernicious. But even the Jewish Colonization Association was not able to resist for long the continued demands of the colonists themselves, nor combat successfully the rising and ever-increasing dissatisfaction among the Jewish masses. In 1907, the colonies were handed over to the colonists, and the duties of self-government were laid upon the shoulders of those who by rights were called upon to bear them. Bureaucracy and absentee landlordism fell at a stroke, and a more healthy spirit was engendered, which made it possible for the colonists to strive for some of the ideals for the sake of which they had attempted the work. Material prosperity followed in the wake of the change. In 1911 the Wine Growers Association of Rishon le-Ziyyon and Zikron-Yaäkob were able to pay off nearly half a million francs of their indebtedness to Baron Rothschild.

[Notes, pp. 221-222]

CHAPTER IV

THEODOR HERZL

On July 3, 1904, the many friends and the innumerable followers of Herzl were shocked to hear of his death. Since then sufficient time has gone by to make both friend and foe calmer and more deliberate in judgment. Perhaps to use the word "foe" in this connection is wrong. Herzl may well have had opponents and critics; foes—if that word connotes enmity and hatred—he could not have had. And if, in the following pages, the personal note resounds too strongly and too persistently, it is because the personality of Herzl signified so much in the unifying and upbuilding work that he did. The doctrines he propounded in his *Judenstaat* were not new. They had been set forth quite as translucently by Pinsker in his *Autoemancipation,* perhaps even with warmer feeling, and certainly with a more intimate acquaintance with Jewish history and Jewish life. They had been preached with the fervor of a prophet by Rülf; they were the foundation stones with which Lilienblum and Levanda had worked. Even the practical measures

enounced by Herzl, by means of which the "Jewish State" was to be built up, are all to be found in Pinsker's pamphlet. The results are all the more strange when we consider that Pinsker intended to call forth a practical realization of his theories, while Herzl's pages were conceived and written as a sort of self-communing, not even destined for a large circle of friends. The *Judenstaat* is the cool reasoning of the philosopher; *Autoemancipation,* the cry of the hunted stag that pants after some haven of refuge. The one is the expression of noble sentiments touched by poetic fancy and of a keen sense of injustice done to others; the second, the prescription of the physician who has studied his own disease, and is ready to plunge the scalpel into his own flesh.

I have intimated that it was largely the personality of Herzl, when once it was forced out into the open by various circumstances, that carried the day and invoked a zeal and a passion perhaps unique in modern history. He possessed in a larger measure than most men intellectual grace and persuasive enthusiasm. In a short time he was surrounded by a band of determined men, to whom his word was almost law, his wish a command. They put themselves willingly under his somewhat auto-

cratic rule, and gathered around his still unfurled banner. No leader of men has ever been placed in exactly the same position. Herzl had nothing visible or future to offer to those who immediately and intimately assisted him—no hopes of preferment, no prospect of personal advancement. Both they and he were to be in the service of an ideal, and in that service they were to do battle together against skepticism within the ranks and opposition without. With very few exceptions, they have proved faithful to their trust. If the term "beautiful" can be applied to a man without derogating his manhood, it can be used of Herzl. But he was no less beautiful in sentiment and in mind than he was in person. He was fascinating intellectually and physically, so that he quickly drew all men within the charmed circle of his influence.

Nor was any one less prepared for the work he was to be called upon to do than was Herzl. Born in Austria and educated for the legal profession at the Vienna University, he had followed the usual course of his Jewish fellow-students, whom larger and more secular interests had drawn away completely from contact with Jewish affairs. He had taken no part in the Jewish revival that had found its way among some of its students at

his Alma Mater. He was practically a stranger to his people, and they to him. His exquisite and facile pen had led him into literature and journalism. As representative of the Neue Freie Presse, he had lived in Paris for a number of years; and this voluntary exile had not served to counteract the secular and universalistic tendencies of a nature that was broad and free. But there was slumbering in him, quietly and unobserved even by himself, a great fund of Jewish feeling and sentiment. I do not know that it was ever called forth during his younger days, though anti-Semitism had begun to be rampant at the Vienna University and the Vienna Rathaus. But his stay in Paris synchronized with the early period of the Dreyfus affair. The anti-Semitic campaign, of which this "affair" was the expression and in the miasma of which it flourished, made a deep impression on his sensitive nature, and awoke with a start his dormant Jewish consciousness.

The *Judenstaat* was written in Paris in the year 1895.[1] It was intended to be nothing more than a private confession of the author to himself and a philosophico-political disquisition for a few intimate friends. The circle in which Herzl moved at that time may be gauged by the fact that when it was

read by one of those friends, he declared unhesitatingly that the author was making straight for the madhouse. That it ever became public was due to the fortuitous circumstance that shortly after this Herzl moved back to Vienna, where he became feuilleton-editor of the newspaper which he had represented in Paris. Not only was Vienna more in touch physically and spiritually with the great Jewish centers of Eastern Europe. In the early "eighties" of the last century Nathan Birnbaum had founded there, largely among Jewish university students, the society Kadimah. This society was thoroughly imbued with the Jewish nationalism that had raised so high the hopes of the Jews in Russia. It was perhaps the first point of contact between the Russian Jews nationalistically inclined and their brethren in other parts of Europe. The Kadimah addressed a letter to Herzl in which it acknowledged its adhesion to his views, and made a direct proposition looking to the founding of a Society of Jews to take up the work Herzl had mapped out. It is significant that it was proposed to fix the headquarters of this society in London. England was one of the few great powers that had not capitulated to anti-Semitism, and whose liberal tendencies continually inspired the hope in Herzl that he would

find a ready assent to his theories among the English Jews.

And, indeed, the first just appreciation of the whole scope of the scheme propounded in the *Judenstaat* was by an English Jew, Israel Zangwill. This brilliant writer and lover of his people happened to be in Vienna shortly after Herzl's return. Zangwill, of course, stood much closer to the immediate Jewish past than Herzl. He had been born and bred in strictly Jewish circles, and, as he knew some part of the Jewish masses better than did his distinguished fellow-artist, he may have recognized many of the difficulties in the situation more clearly than Herzl. But his poetic imagination was fired by the novel conception and the daring solution proposed therein. Here at least was a theory and an interpretation inspiring in their mettle and their audacity. The Jewish public ought to have a chance to hear them—to accept or to refuse. It was through Zangwill's instrumentality that Herzl was invited to appear before the Maccabaeans in London, July 6, 1896.[2] Herzl himself had inaugurated the public discussion of what has now become known as Zionism [3] by a letter to the Jewish Chronicle, in which he says: "My pamphlet will open a general discussion on

the Jewish question. . . . [The newly-formed society] will then find out for the first time whether the Jews really wish to go to the Promised Land, and whether they ought to go there." The first edition of the *Judenstaat* had been published in Vienna in 1896.[4]

I have had occasion to refer to the answer which certain sections of European Jewry had given to the anti-Semitic attack. By his aloofness from Jewish affairs, Herzl had followed along similar lines, probably without much thought, and unconsciously led by his early surroundings and upbringing. But just as soon as the question became formulated in his mind, his native nobility of feeling rose in revolt against the supine attitude such a course involved, and his clear-sighted vision saw the fatuousness of such a program, if program it could be called. He soon saw that the answer to anti-Semitism was not to be found in a dull resignation that accepted an impossible situation, but rather in a constructive policy that would remove some of the causes that had contributed to make the disease possible, and would restore to the Jews the self-consciousness they were in danger of losing. The *Judenstaat* and what it represented were the answer to anti-Semitism.

In the whole pamphlet there was nothing really new. Both the underlying principles and the means suggested to make them fruitful of result are contained in Pinsker's *Autoemancipation.* I am assured that Herzl had never heard of this work until several years had elapsed, as little as he had known of Hess' *Rome and Jerusalem* or Rülf's *Arukat Bat Ammi.* It is therefore the more remarkable that the conclusions are so similar. Starting from the premise that anti-Semitism is a continually increasing menace, and that evidently it is eradicable, he comes to the conclusion that the outside world does not desire to amalgamate with the Jews, except upon conditions that are subversive of the continuance of the Jews as a people. Unless the Jewish people is desirous of committing collective suicide, it must find some egress from a position which, with every year, is becoming less and less tenable. That which it needs is a definite and certain home, and it is to the accomplishment of this need that Herzl devotes most of his attention. He demands the formation of a new organization, a "Society of Jews." No existing corporate body appeared to him to be sufficiently broad to serve as a sure foundation for so important a work. This society is to make all the preliminary scientific and

political investigations. Then a "Jewish Company" is to be founded, with a capital of fifty million pounds and with its seat in London. Herzl obviously had in mind the great English trading-companies, which, half-political and half-mercantile, had administered, under the supervision of the Crown, vast territories in Asia and Africa. For this reason, too, he already adumbrated the idea of a charter, which, in the years following, was to loom so large in Zionist discussions. The conclusions come to by the "Society of Jews" are to be put in practice by the "Jewish Company", in whose hands, too, was to be placed the organization of the new community.

The distinguishing feature of Herzl's presentment is the greater stress he lays upon the practical consummation of the plan as compared with that of his predecessors. His general political outlook was larger and wider. He envisages the question in its totality. Notwithstanding a poetic foresight that was native in him, he writes with the pen of a politician and speaks the language of a statesman. The fire of the prophet, which lights up the writings of his German and Russian precursors, never gains the ascendancy over the cooler judgment of the practical legislator. Palestine exercises no fascina-

tion upon him. He shows no trace of a knowledge of the Chovevi Zion movement or of the various attempts made to rebuild the waste places in the land of the forefathers. Palestine is but one of various possibilities for Jewish settlement, as is Argentina or Canada. In the *Judenstaat* there are no dithyrambics. Everywhere cool pronouncements that capture the mind rather than transport the imagination. It is for this reason perhaps that Herzl was understood of the West, and his argumentative presentation had a greater chance of success than the more elaborate disputations of previous writers. In one word, he is a cool and modern man of the world, speaking to moderns like himself.

From all the evidence it is plain that Herzl never had the slightest idea of placing himself at the head of a practical organization.[5] He had been led by others to give his ideas to the world at large. The very force of circumstances was to take him away from his desk and from the quiet of his study into the turmoil and ferment of public life. But just as chance had discovered in him the deep-set racial Jew, so it was to reveal the statesman. Even in exile the Jews had from time to time developed men of large political views, men capable of leading

the ship of state. One is led at once to think of such men as Disraeli, Crémieux, Luzzatti, Sonino, and others, if only modern times are taken into account. But, with the exception of Don Joseph of Naxos in the sixteenth century and Adolphe Crémieux in the nineteenth, none of these statesmen had placed his abilities and his opportunities in the service of his own brethren. Other nations and stranger peoples had profited of their gifts. Herzl's special claim rests upon his unique devotion to the needs and aspirations of the Jewish people.

Slowly but surely the consciousness deepened in Herzl's mind that his first step forward necessitated a second. The adhesion of the Vienna Kadimah and the request for a meeting at which the whole subject should be discussed, soon determined him to proceed. He was not deterred by the somewhat lukewarm reception he had met in London. Herzl's greatest fault perhaps was his besetting optimism. As Nordau said of him in his memorial address at the Seventh Congress,[6] he imagined that he had behind him a multitude of Herzls, "that very many Jews had, like himself, determined no longer to bear oppression, that they had his steel will, his moral earnestness, his ideal inspiration, his unstinted unselfishness, his self-sacrifice." But



THE SEC
BASEL, A

following p. 92



ONGRESS

-31 1898

such optimism is indispensable in any leader of men.

The call for the First Congress, which was to be the beginning of Herzl's constructive policy, was issued early in 1897. Another circumstance had, in the meantime, intervened, which was calculated to induce him to persevere. The public discussions of his pamphlet had penetrated far and wide. From the very first Herzl had desired this publicity. He believed that the Jewish question was one that intimately affected certain political considerations, and the interests of various states demanded that it should be settled; and, especially, a permanent settlement could be effected only if it were reached to the satisfaction and with the assistance of European diplomacy. In some manner, not as yet explained, the publication of the *Judenstaat* and the theories it contained, had been brought to the notice of the Turkish Sultan. He dispatched to Herzl, in May, 1896, a secret emissary, the Chevalier de Newlinsky, with the offer of a charter for Palestine, in return for the cessation of the European press campaign against him because of the Armenian massacres.[7] The Sultan had the usual exaggerated idea of the power of the Jews in the Continental press, and endeavored, in this manner, to buy off the just criticism of the barbarities he had inflicted

upon a race with a history somewhat similar to that of the Jews in its tragedy and lonesomeness. Not only were the Jews not so powerful in this respect as the Sultan supposed; they were not so supine as to execute such a bargain and reach their own goal over the dead bodies of another race. Unfortunately, too, they were not sufficiently proud to make a distinctively Jewish question their own. The Neue Freie Presse, of which Herzl was one of the editors, never once mentioned the word Zionism as long as the leader lived.

Perhaps the attitude of the Vienna newspaper was the attitude the greater part of Western Jewry would have desired to take in the premises, had this been possible. To ignore the assaults upon positions considered impregnable is good tactics, when the assumption that they are impregnable is correct. As long as the questions raised remained subjects for academic discussion within the Jewish camp, such a policy, though not one of the highest virtue, was possible. But the call for a Congress meant the passage from discussion to deed, and the ardor and spirit with which the campaign for it was carried on made it necessary that the various Jewish organizations and certain public men should define their position towards the new movement. It must

be admitted that their position was, in most cases, frankly hostile. This hostility came from the most varied quarters—from Orthodox, from Reform, from No-nothing Jews. Even the Chovevi Zion in Western Europe refused to join hands, and the larger organizations, such as the Alliance in Paris, the Jewish Colonization Association, and the Vienna Allianz, announced a determined opposition. That this antagonism proceeded from such different spheres is evidence that the question turned about some basal idea, and that the Jews were lined up in two opposing forces on either side of it. For the Reform Jews Zionism was too orthodox; for the Orthodox it was not sufficiently religious; for the No-nothings it was too Jewish.

If we take the last class first, it is easy to see that the new pronouncement required of such Jews a great mental and moral effort. I should not care to say that many of them were incapable of such an effort. To make such a demand for effort from the plain man of the street is perhaps asking too much, whether in the interest of Zionism or of any other idea. He is accustomed to follow the line of least resistance. He objects to being awakened somewhat rudely. Especially in this case he was averse to being asked to take sides. It was a question from

which he had hoped to escape; and he feared for the social position which he imagined he had secured at the cost of his own and his forefather's past. If his circumstances were such as to render him free from all cares, Zionism came in as a sort of *trouble fête,* and the quicker done with it the better.

The religious difficulties scented by the Orthodox in the new movement are readily intelligible. The Messianic idea among the Jews, which was firmly coupled with that of the Restoration, was opposed to a human realization of the hope, in strong contrast to the Christian, which was based upon a more human accomplishment. But, even apart from such doctrinal considerations, many of the leaders of the new Zionism were indifferent to religious sentiment and disassociated from Jewish practices. Herzl himself belonged in this category, as also some of his principal helpers. Indeed, it must be conceded that early there were currents discernible in the movement that were definitely anti-religious; and, in general, the insistence upon the view that the question was economic and political rather than religious, was calculated to fill the Orthodox with alarm. The opposition from this quarter has never wholly disappeared, even

though Herzl was compelled by the logic of events to become more Palestinian in his attitude, and even though the Second Congress passed a resolution defining clearly the official attitude of the movement,[8] without, of course, impairing the freedom of the individual member. At a later period a break was made, and a section of the Orthodox camp, under the name of Mizrachi, joined the Zionists, and has very noticeably made its influence felt. But, though one can understand the religious difficulty which the Orthodox apprehended, one fails to appreciate the tactics of abstention. Zionism, whatever else might result from it, made for a deepened sense of Jewish solidarity, a profounder study of Jewish history, and a wider sympathy with all manifestations of the Jewish spirit. It was in a line with a part at least of Orthodox aspirations. In truth, upon the appearance of Herzl's pamphlet, Doctor Güdemann, Chief Rabbi of Vienna, wrote to the author, "I have read it through, and find nothing in it to criticise."[9] In the same manner, Doctor J. H. Dünner, Chief Rabbi of North Holland, a well-known Talmudic authority, welcomed the Zionist program from the standpoint of traditional Judaism, though carefully distinguishing between that program and the fulfillment of Messianic

prophecy,[10] an opinion concurred in by Doctor M. Friedländer, the learned principal of Jews' College, London.[11]

The greatest opposition, however, came from the Reform wing of the Jewish Church. Under this designation I comprehend all those Jews who believe that a certain evolution must take place in religious formulae as well as in religious forms, and who hold that in every age Judaism can and must fit itself to the changed conditions in which it finds itself. This opposition was to be expected. The central thought of the whole Reform movement had been the disassociation, in a large measure, of religion and nationality, the insistence upon the universality of the Jewish religion, and the hope of Messianism (a term which I use merely for want of a better), in the promulgation of which the Jews were to take an active part. It will be seen readily that such ideals militated, in some material points, against the fundamental theories of Jewish nationalism and of Zionism. Jewish nationality had no meaning for those who held such views. In fact, the old Talmudic dictum, "The laws of the land in which the Jews live are the laws that must be obeyed,"[12] had been reiterated times without number, and

had been stretched almost beyond recognition. Wherever a conflict occurred between the laws of the state and the Jewish law, there was a tendency to decide in favor of the former. The dispersion of the Jews was held to be providential and necessary for the propagation of the monotheistic faith. Any undue concentration, therefore, worked counter to divine purpose, and, putting the hands of the clock back,[13] delayed unduly the consummation of the hope which was the well-spring of Judaism.

Even in Russia this distinction between what may be called Jewish Jews and un-Jewish Jews was apparent. While the chief Hebrew newspapers, Ha-Meliz and Ha-Zefirah, welcomed Zionism, the Voskhod, written in Russian, was violently opposed to it. Advanced Jewish Reform in Germany and in America was fully prepared to take such an attitude of resistance. It had removed all mention of Zion and Jerusalem from the official prayer book. But in other centers the hope of the restoration still remained as an integral part of Jewish doctrine as expressed in Jewish prayers, and these had to be explained away. The Chief Rabbi of Vienna had revised his former attitude; he now declared that "Zion" was nothing but a symbol of the future

of Judaism and of the world, that the rôle of the Jews lies in the very opposite direction to that preached by Zionism—as solvers of nationalism and preachers of internationalism.[14] Lucien Wolf concedes that the highest traditional ideal of Judaism is undoubtedly national, which he, however, qualifies by adding, "It is not the nation of a kept principality, but the holy nation of a kingdom of priests."[15] This is also the central thought of Doctor K. Kohler, who characterizes the mission of the Jews to be "not only spiritual or religious in character," but also "social and intellectual," and he opposes to official Zionism what he calls the "true Zionism," which "demands of the Jews to be martyrs in the cause of truth and justice and peace."[16] Along similar lines, Claude Montefiore proclaims that the Jews must continue "to fight the good fight, not to despair, but with self-purification and brave endurance to await the better time that civilization will shortly bring, when their fellow-citizens will claim them as their own."[17] And, as regards the immediate question, as it presented itself in Eastern Europe, especially in Russia and Roumania, a somewhat unhealthy optimism reigned. The parole was given out, "The Russo-Jewish question must be solved in Russia itself,"

and various attempts were made to bring about the betterment of the situation in Roumania by diplomatic and economic pressure. In both instances failure waited upon the efforts.

But, in addition to the doctrinal considerations noted above, which held many critics of Zionism as in a vise, there was added a certain solicitude and mistrust, an apprehension that Zionism might bring in its wake a catastrophe boding evil to the political positions won by the Jews in so many modern civilized states. Continental anti-Semitism had made much of the charge that the Jews were strangers in the various lands of the Diaspora, and had urged that they be treated as such in all future legislation. It was feared by many that Zionism justified such a charge, and would give a handle to all manner of obloquy that might be cast upon the Jews as not being full-fledged citizens of the states in which they lived.

They [the Zionists] are part-authors of the anti-Semitism which they profess to slay, wrote Laurie Magnus.[18] For how can European countries which the Jews propose to "abandon" justify their retention of the Jews? And why should civil equality have been won by the strenuous exertions of the Jews, if the Jews themselves be the first to "evacuate" their position and to claim the bare courtesy of "foreign visitors"?

The same disquietude was exhibited in other quarters, and a certain chauvinism which was deemed necessary as a counterblast to Zionist propaganda. In one part of the Jewish world the Central Conference of American Rabbis declared:

> Such [*i. e.* Zionist] attempts do not benefit, but infinitely harm, our Jewish brethren where they are still persecuted, by confirming the assertion of their enemies that the Jews are foreigners in the countries in which they are at home, and of which they are everywhere the most loyal and patriotic citizens.[19]

In another part of the world, Professor Ludwig Geiger sounded the German note on the Jewish clarion:

> Zionism is as dangerous to the German spirit as are social democracy and ultramontanism. . . . The German Jew who has a voice in German literature must, as he has been accustomed to for the last century and a half, look upon Germany alone as his fatherland, upon the German language as his mother tongue, and the future of the German nation must remain the only one upon which he bases his hopes. Any desire to form together with his coreligionists a people outside of Germany is, not to speak of its impracticability, downright thanklessness towards the nation in whose midst he lives—a chimera; for the German Jew is a German in his national peculiarities, and Zion is for him the land only of the past, not of the future.[20]

Indeed, the dissonance grew so great as to become dangerous. The opponents of Zionism were

ready to appeal for outside help in order to put down the unwelcome intruder. The inauspicious effect of such a course, when it had been tried in the past, cried out aloud against a renewal of the attempt. One remembers all that happened at the time of the Second Monarchy, when Hellenists and anti-Hellenists called in the secular arm in the solution of internal difficulties; the dangers to which the Prussian Jewish communities exposed themselves in 1817,[21] when the Government was invited to inhibit the introduction of reform services, or again in 1843,[22] when the Senate of Frankfort-on-the-Main was called in to inforce a ritual provision. Yet the suggestion of the same Professor Geiger, that "the withdrawal of citizen's rights appears to be the necessary consequence of German enactments against Zionism, the only answer the German national conscience can give," can only be construed as an invitation to the German Government to come to the aid of the opponents of Zionism.

Happily this was the expression only of an individual, and fell flat because of the very exuberance of its chauvinism. Yet the feeling in Germany was strong enough to bring forth a public pronouncement on the part of the Association of Rabbis in Germany (July 16, 1897), which declared[23]

that the attempts of the Zionists to found a Jewish national state in Palestine are contrary to the Messianic promises of Judaism as laid down in Holy Writ and in the later religious authorities; that Judaism demands of its adherents to serve the state in which they live and in every way to further its national interests; but that no opposition thereto can be seen in the noble plan to colonize Palestine with Jewish agriculturalists, because that plan has no connection with the founding of a national state.

The limitation contained in the last sentences of the foregoing declaration evidently foreshadowed a compromise, or, at least, it suggested the possibility of an *entente*. Not only would it remove the discussion from what was evidently a field of battle; it squared the radical opponents of Zionism with the Orthodox wing, and removed the taint of indifference to the uplifting of Palestine. In all *ententes*, of course, there must be a certain limitation on both sides; but the limitation demanded of the Zionists was one which in good conscience they could not possibly accept. It meant a return to simple Chovevi Zionism, with just those elements eradicated which constituted the propelling force and individuality of the new movement. It signified a reaction to the older method of solving Jewish difficulties, and it took no account of the palpable fact that all attempts at a philanthropic solution had proved failures. It was Jewish nation-

alism that offended the taste of these opponents. But nationalism was the very heart of Zionism. Without it all the other members would become atrophied. The contending positions were thus clearly defined: the two sides had joined issue.

The complaint has been raised in some quarters that by insisting upon its propaganda Zionism has caused a split and a division in the Jewish ranks; that it has set community against community; even, at times, house against house. The impeachment is perhaps true, but a complaint on that account is unwarranted. A large and dispersed community, such as the Jewish, is bound to exhibit much diversity as its opinions develop. It would mean spiritual death, were absolute uniformity to be its characteristic, more especially at a time when so large a proportion of its members were in sufferance, and when the outlook was so absolutely dreary. The first three-quarters of the nineteenth century had been fruitful of the great questions connected with the attainment of civic freedom and political equality as far as concerned the relation of the Jews to the outside world. Within the community, the battle had raged over the right of individual and collective freedom in religious matters. In Western Jewries the battle for civic and political freedom

had been won. As regards religious freedom within the community, one cannot help feeling that the debate had been "talked out," but with a sort of tacit understanding that the right demanded had been conceded.

When we read the Jewish newspapers of the day or peruse the reports of the various Rabbinical Conferences, we are struck with the meagerness and paltriness of the questions at issue, when compared with the exhausting passions they called forth. But this meagerness is only apparent, not real. For the underlying idea was to make possible the further development of Jewish law, so that it should not become petrified, as it had threatened to become in the *Shulhan Aruk*. So uncompromising a radical as Samuel Holdheim was acknowledged, even by his fiercest opponents, to be a studied Talmudist. His *Maämar ha-Ishut*, a memorable treatise designed to advance the position of women as members of the Synagogue, is a piece of fine Talmudic reasoning. At the various conferences, another Reformer, though less uncompromising, Abraham Geiger, made his demands from the basis of Talmudic law; as likewise did Samuel Adler, later minister at Temple Emanuel in New York. Without prejudice it may be said that an

untoward fate prevented the two parties at the conferences from coming together and directing future development. But the more conservative wing evidently took fright, and, through their retreat, not only emphasized the cleft between them and their opponents, but also drove the opponents further and further afield from the traditional basis.

These interminable bouts in regard to minor points connected with the synagogue service and with ritual observances palled upon the palate, and some new vivifying force was necessary to galvanize the body politic. This new force was Zionism. In the face of this question all others paled, so that many wondered how the older questions could ever have called forth the feeling and the fire they did. The national question became an international Jewish one in the highest sense of the term. It set the Jews to thinking hard. I cannot see that anything has been lost by the fierceness with which the battle raged. On the contrary, much has been won that will work permanent advantage. A question has been put that is one of life and death. It has called into the firing-line of each of the two parties the most experienced and the best-tried warriors.

[Notes, pp. 223-224]

CHAPTER V

THE JEWISH CONGRESS

I have said that the summoning of the Congress was the first constructive work attempted by Herzl. Its importance lay in the fact that it was not only to be the means for concentrating various efforts that were being made towards a common goal, but in itself it was the announcement of a definite policy. That policy is intimately connected with all Zionist endeavor. It meant organization, and, what is more, organization upon a democratic basis. It may be said with truth that no such attempt had been made since the times immediately following the destruction of the Jewish polity. For since that time the Jews had lived as mere scattered communities. They had been held together in a loose and much disjointed brotherhood, a brotherhood of bondage for the most part, informed by a spiritual ideal. But something more than this was needed in a world of hard fact. Common forms of worship and a common ghettohood had been the clasp that kept the communities from going too far

asunder. The walls of the Ghetto, however, had fallen, and the forms of worship tended to differentiate more and more. The danger of complete disintegration was very real.

Even then no endeavor was evident to reunite the scattered remnants for common action along any one line. It is true that the Alliance Israélite Universelle had had this purpose at its inception; its name indicates this. But it never realized its high aim. In the nature of things, it was impossible. The broad basis was wanting, upon which alone such a fabric could be built up, and the leaders were necessarily impotent to resist the claims of French nationalism, which effectively mastered their Jewish feeling. In a short time, sister-societies grew up in Austria, England, and Germany, that were as naturally in the bonds of their own country's nationalism as the parent society.

Democracy, too, was at bottom dear to the Jewish heart. The Jews have always shown a strong individualistic tendency. It can be followed right through their history. It is evident in the sterner Biblical times; according to one version, the very institution of kingship was not really in accord with the divine wish.[1] It comes to light during the struggles of the Second Commonwealth. The

Jewish communities in Europe were democratic in their form of government in the Middle Ages. With the passing of the priestly functions, the last shadow of special prerogative vanished away.[2] The Synagogue knew no priesthood; no privileged class exercised functions that were impossible for the humblest congregant. It is only in such deformed products of religious exaltation as Hasidism that the semblance of functional authority has made its appearance. In Germany, the office of Landesrabbiner was often forced upon the Jewish communities by the state for purposes of more active supervision of the congregations. In England the Chief Rabbi has gradually been shorn of all real power. The Grand Rabbin de France has been "Grand" mainly from the government point of view, notwithstanding the personal excellence of the holders of the position. In Italy, nearly every rabbi of a large community is a Rabbino Maggiore. Every attempt to establish even a spiritual headship seems to have failed. It is only in the nearer East that a certain amount of power was always granted to either the lay or the spiritual head of the Jewish bodies, from the Resh Geluta (Exilarch) in Babylon down to the Hakam Bashis of modern Mohammedan countries. And, indeed, it is one of the argu-

ments usually brought forward against the Zionist platform that the Jew is assumed to be unwilling to subject his own will to that of other Jews. Yet, without any organization, no concerted action was possible. Was it now to prove successful on a broad democratic and secular basis, and in a manner that made the leaders as it were responsible ministers to the people at large?

Regarded from yet another point of view, the Congress idea was of significance. The Jews had had no forum from the boards of which they could speak to the world at large outside. The non-Jewish world has always known very little of real Jewish sentiment. Whenever it has tried to understand, it has usually misunderstood it. This was, in a measure, the fault of the Jews themselves, and various attempts have been made by rabbinical associations and by a modern vernacular press to remove this reproach. It is not belittling these laudable efforts to hold them to have been insufficient for the purpose. They neither spoke with incorporate authority, nor were their utterances received as having been made *in coram publicam.* A Congress of Jews, speaking with a delegated authority in the name of a large body of the people, holding its deliberations in public, and in that way

attracting the attention of Europe and America, was calculated to have a wide hearing and serve the cause of the Jews in general.

It has been argued that the Zionists arrogated to themselves an office they did not in reality possess, that of speaking in the name of the whole Jewish people, though they represented merely a section of that people. The arraignment is not without some justification, which, however, on second thought, is more seeming than real. It is true that only a portion of the Jewish people stood sponsor to the idea of the Congress, but it must not be forgotten that in this respect a great part of the whole body was quite inarticulate. It had little thought for anything beyond its own individual and present needs. There were no means at hand to make its voice heard, and, had it been possible to take a poll, it would be hazardous to presume the result. In addition, of all Jews it was the Zionists who had the lustiest wish to live, who desired action that would keep the Jews together as a people. This is said without prejudice to the non-Zionist camp, and without any intention to brand those who did not agree with them as less good Jews than the Zionists thought themselves to be. Nor did the Congress ever hide, or seek to hide, the fact that it

had its many opponents. But it felt that its composition had a certain universally Jewish character. It was made up of delegates representing all the various phases of Jewish life and thought—Orthodox, Reform, indifferent in religious matters, and frankly non-religious, Chovevi Zionists, and pure nationalists. Looked at from this point of view, the assumption of the Congress to speak for what has been well called Catholic Israel[3] was not the presumption it seemed to be at first sight.

It had been intended to hold the First Congress in Munich. That it met in Basel was due to the opposition of the official Jewish community in the first-named city. When one reads the various pronouncements made at the time against the holding of the Congress, even the lapse of years does not lessen one's astonishment, for the leading motive seems to have been one of fear and of dread—fear of a public discussion of Jewish problems, dread of the results likely to follow any success the Zionists might achieve. In the circumstances, Herzl and his friends had the proper instinct in yielding. It would have been a disservice to the Jewish cause to have exhibited Jewish dissension to the world in so palpable a form. It would have been a calamity for the new movement to have had its birth at-

tended by strife and discord. Passive resistance might be overcome and overwhelmed; active opposition, however, might have proven a death-blow.

The First Congress was, therefore, held in Basel, in August, 1897. It was, to a large extent, preparatory. It was a manifestation, not only to the Jewish, but also to the non-Jewish world. But its chief import lies in the fact that it drew up a declaration which, in its opening paragraph, has become the watchword of the whole movement, and which is universally known as "the Basel Program." This paragraph affirms that "the object of Zionism is to establish for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine." The terseness with which this expression is worded makes some explanation necessary. The words "publicly and legally assured" in themselves emphasize the broad view taken of the question. In bringing it to the attention of the world, the Congress laid stress upon the fact that what was demanded was a *right* and not a *favor,* and the Jewish masses counted upon the assistance of more fortunate peoples in attaining the status which these enjoyed. In a negative way it suggested that the root of the whole business lay in the fact that the Jews as a people had no home, and, such being the

case, they became easily the play-ball of contending factions and of warring interests. But that home, to be effectively assured to the Jewish people, must be "legally" recognized as such by the forces that controlled the forward movement of modern civilization. For a home under other conditions might become as insecure as the present tenure in various lands. International recognition was imperatively needed.

There were also added the important words "in Palestine." They mark a step forward in the program as originally laid down in the *Judenstaat*. It will be remembered that there Herzl had in mind Palestine or any other country that might be found suitable. The declaration evidently takes account of only one country, and as Herzl was the one who finally formulated it, the words denote a distinct change in his mental attitude. What was the cause of this change? It is not far to seek. Not only had he felt as it were the pulse of the Jewish people; not only had he come to see that the Jewish heart was beating for one spot, and that the great forward course he desired his people to take was possible only if it was fired by a propelling sentiment. Not that alone. By reason of his closer contact with Jews and with Jewish affairs, Herzl

had at last found himself, and had, of his own accord, reached the view that the future of Israel was bound up irrevocably with Palestine. Though the large majority of his followers either had preceded him on this road of mental development, or were carried forward on it by him, a number remained behind. A strong minority in the organization and in the Congress insisted upon the older standpoint, and formed an active opposition, which led in after years to the exciting scenes of the Sixth and the Seventh Congress, and eventually to the formation of the Ito, or territorialist group.

Ten sessions of the Congress were held between 1897 and 1911; from 1897 to 1901 yearly; from that time forward biennially. I have said that a certain change had taken place in Herzl's attitude regarding Palestine. But it must not be forgotten that he still held to the large political view of the whole question. He was, above all, endowed with the qualities of a statesman, and it was from the statesman's angle that he mapped out the work he and the organization were to do. Above all, he wanted Zionism to move on a lofty and generous plane. He was, therefore, a determined opponent of the Chovevi Zionists, not so much because of their aims as because of their methods. In his vari-

ous presidential addresses to the Congress, he emphasized this view sufficiently. He did not believe anything was to be gained by what he called the smuggling of a few families into Palestine. Such a policy was, he thought, unworthy of a great cause, and a source of prejudice to the ultimate object in view. He believed it was necessary to advance on quite different lines, to secure, first and foremost, the political rights, without which any extended colonization was practically useless, before proceeding with such colonization. In this manner he came to be looked upon, by a portion even of his own adherents, as an opponent of Palestinian colonization. Those who were in his confidence knew that this was a wrong interpretation to put upon his attitude; and, in the state in which the Turkish Empire was at that time, Herzl's attitude was probably right.

Under Abdul Hamid, Turkey had gone steadily on the downward track. The continual interference of the Palace in the engagements of the Porte had brought about a state of affairs that rendered all things precarious, and Herzl felt that unless the political guarantees were first secured upon which any tenure of land in Palestine was held, the Jewish colonies there ran the risk of sudden

annihilation at almost any moment. In fact, a warning note was heard in the year 1900. In the month of November instructions were sent to the Vali of Beirut not to permit Jewish visitors to remain in Palestine longer than three months. They had also to be provided with a "red ticket," as a sign that they were only transient guests. The regulations were not new. They had been promulgated some twelve years previously, but since that time they had practically remained in abeyance. Their revival naturally struck consternation to the hearts of all those concerned for the welfare and growth of the Palestinian colonies. To the honor of two of the great powers, Italy and the United States, it must be said that they made an immediate protest on the ground that they could not allow any distinction to be drawn between their Christian and their Jewish subjects in so far as treaty rights were concerned.[4] The incident, however, serves to show that there was some reason and much ground for Herzl's fears.

Herzl's negotiations with the Sultan, carried on in various ways between the years 1898 and 1903, seemed to lead to no definite result. Of these negotiations more will be said later on. It is perhaps idle to speculate now upon the good or

bad faith of the Sultan in the various offers he made. Even if they had been in good faith, the Jewish people refused to give Herzl the means with which to close any bargain. They were sufficiently unimaginative to decline the risk of a few paltry millions in getting at the heart of the evil, when so many were being spent yearly in trying to make good its ravages. The foul-weather friends were too numerous who scented danger in every trial of strength. All such negotiations are long, arduous, and very tortuous. In addition, it was impossible to keep the Congresses fully informed of transactions in their nature private and only preliminary. Many in the organization itself grew restless and, wanting something to fan their fainting courage, demanded a quicker *tempo* and more evident results. This was especially true of two groups in the Congress, one representing the older Chovevi Zion view, and composed of those who were Zionists because they were Chovevi Zionists, and not the reverse, and to whom the name Ziyyone Zionists, or Zionists *à outrance,* was given; the other made up of pure nationalists, whose specific interest was directed to Palestine as *a* possible center rather than *the only* possible one. It was this latter group that was most insistent. It

reasoned—and the reasoning was logical from its point of view—that if the undertakings with the Sultan were likely to prove abortive, it behooved the Zionist leaders to look elsewhere and find another land in which the much-desired home could be established. It is from this point of view that we must regard the attempt made in 1899 by Davis Trietsch and others to transfer Jewish colonization to the island of Cyprus. Had the economic conditions there been of a kind to make success likely, such a settlement might have been regarded as a stepping-stone to Palestinian colonization, with the additional advantage of the ordered life and circumstances which had been introduced into that island since the agreement between England and Turkey had placed it under British administration. But the mere mention of the project at the Third Congress (1899) aroused such violent opposition that even its consideration was rendered impossible.[5]

In a similar light the concession demanded for a Jewish settlement in El-Arish must be regarded. The land so called comprises a strip of territory of about one thousand square kilometers. It is situated to the south of Palestine, and forms the connecting link between that country and Egypt; as

it were, between Asia and Africa. One can almost say that it is a no-man's land, in the sense that it is most sparsely settled, and whatever natural advantages it may possess have never been developed. It was under Anglo-Egyptian administration, and any tenure obtained there would be certain. It was also nearer Palestine, much nearer than Cyprus; in fact, geographically it was a part of that country. The whole matter had originally been broached by the German Zionists at their yearly meeting in May, 1901. It was taken up by Herzl in the autumn of 1902, as he himself said, "because of the unsuccess of the latest negotiations in Constantinople and in view of the increasing distress [among the Jewish masses]."[6] The negotiations opened in London were pursued in Cairo, and at the beginning of 1903 a scientific expedition, accompanied by a delegate representing the Anglo-Egyptian Government, was sent thither to report upon the feasibility of the plan. The report of this commission has never been made public; but it is generally understood not to have been unfavorable. The negative outcome, however, of the whole business seems to have been due to personal considerations, albeit the official reason given out by the Anglo-Egyptian Government was the lack of

water there, which would necessitate the use of some of the Nile overflow for irrigation purposes, and this could not be spared by Egypt. In view of what was to follow, it should be noted that the Anglo-Egyptian Government had manifested a wise understanding and appreciation of Jewish needs, in showing itself willing to accord to a Jewish settlement in El-Arish, should such be finally determined on, a Jewish administration and certain extended municipal powers. The failure is, therefore, deeply to be regretted, as such a settlement would have made possible an experiment in Jewish self-government which would have been both profitable and instructive.

The spirit in which the British Government had treated the proposal concerning El-Arish was particularly pleasing and encouraging. The good-will and support of the statesmen of a land that often championed the rights of a minority, that was thoroughly imbued with liberal ideas and tendencies, and that had had such varied experiences in colonization, was rightly looked upon by Herzl as a most valuable asset. The "Jewish Colonial Trust" had been established in London, and, though the Zionist movement has been most careful not to identify itself with the national aspirations of any one of

the great or small powers, the British Government may have felt that it owed it some kind of friendly tutelage. It is probable also that the failure of the El-Arish negotiations weighed in the balance, at least with some of her statesmen. Joseph Chamberlain was at that time the most powerful figure in the English Cabinet. The Boer War had just been ended, and Chamberlain set out to visit the English possessions beyond the sea in South and Eastern Africa. The East-African Protectorate stretches from the Indian Ocean, with Mombassa as the chief port, as far over as Lake Tanganyika. It was while visiting this country that Chamberlain conceived the idea that here might be found a convenient place for the Jewish settlement Herzl had proposed to him in El-Arish.

It seems certain that the proposal did not come, in the first instance, from the Zionists. The possibility of such a settlement had been mooted in the London Jewish Chronicle in July, 1903, by a correspondent, Robert P. Yates, who was entirely outside of the Zionist body.[7] The negotiations culminated in an official letter dated, from the Foreign Office, August 14, 1903, in which Sir Clement Hill writes to Mr. L. J. Greenberg in regard " to the form of an agreement which Doctor

Herzl proposes should be entered into between his Majesty's Government and the Jewish Colonial Trust Ltd., for the establishment of a Jewish settlement in East Africa." The letter goes on to say that the Marquis of Lansdowne

has studied the question with the interest which his Majesty's Government must always take in any well-considered scheme for the amelioration of the position of the Jewish race. . . . If a site can be found which the Trust and his Majesty's commissioner consider suitable, and which commends itself to his Government, Lord Lansdowne will be prepared to entertain favorably proposals for the establishment of a Jewish colony or settlement on conditions which will enable the members to observe their national customs . . . . the details of the scheme comprising as its main features the grant of a considerable area of land, the appointment of a Jewish official as the chief of the local administration, and permission to the colony to have a free hand in regard to municipal legislation as to the management of religious and purely domestic matters, such local autonomy being conditional upon the right of his Majesty's Government to exercise general control.[8]

It has been said in some quarters, and I think with reason, that this letter marks an epoch in Jewish history. No Government up to that time or since has put itself on record as taking up the Jewish cause in so noble and so whole-hearted a manner. It is not concerned with individual Jews or with a small community, but with the whole "Jewish

MEDAL STRUCK IN HONOR OF THE SECOND CONGRESS

race"; and its offer contained a measure of self-government which might well tempt the most sanguine nationalist: a grant of land, a Jewish head official, and practical autonomy under the general control of the home Government. Invitations to the Jews to settle in various countries, it is true, have not been unknown. The case of Sultan Bayazid II of Turkey at the end of the fifteenth century is in point; the more recent (1912) offer of a tract of land in Angola by the Portuguese Republican Government may also be cited. But no Government has ever taken the step to invite the formation of an autonomous settlement of the Jewish people. It is as well to state here that official Zionist hopes and aspirations had never gone beyond that point. In a letter dated December 14, 1903, Doctor Herzl had laid down the conditions upon which alone the scheme could be acceptable. These were:

1. The territory has to be sufficiently extensive to admit of an immigration of such a character as should be eventually a material relief to the pressure which to-day exists in Eastern Jewry. 2. It follows that the territory has to be one colonizable by such a people as ours. 3. The concession has to be invested with such autonomous rights as would insure the Jewish character of the settlement; and 4, perhaps governing all, the enthusiasm of our own people in respect to the offer has to be of such a nature

as will overcome all the obvious difficulties, which under most favorable conditions will be bound to arise in the creation of the settlement.[9]

It is true that, from time to time, some Zionists of more stalwart than sober faith, have spoken of a Jewish state fully independent, with all the accompaniments and appanages belonging thereto. But the more sober and deliberate judgment of those who spoke with authority has never gone beyond the borders of reasonableness. The "Basel Platform" speaks of a *home,* in which Jewish aspirations may be realized. A *home* demands security and permanence; and, under the aegis of a great and liberal power and with a measurable amount of autonomy, such a *home* could be more readily procured and preserved than if independence were complete and unrestricted. Besides, where at the present day is such a land to be found which is not in the possession, or at least within the purview, of one of the Powers?

The position of Herzl was indeed difficult. The letter of Sir Clement Hill had come to him almost on the eve of the Sixth Congress (August 23-28, 1903). The delegates were tense with suppressed emotion. Herzl had just returned from St. Petersburg, where he had been in consulta-

tion with Witte and von Plehve in the endeavor to mitigate the harshness of a secret circular which the latter minister had issued to the governors, city prefects, and chiefs of police, putting a ban upon all Zionist meetings and forbidding all collections for Zionist purposes. Though he had in a measure succeeded, and had obtained the promise of a possible mitigation of the interdict, his action had been misunderstood, especially by many of the Russian delegates, whose natural indignation at the cruelties, for most of which they held von Plehve personally responsible, made them distrust the minister and any promise given at his hand. By presenting the letter of the English Government, he ran the risk also of alienating the Chovevi Zion element in the Congress, who were known to be intransigent on the subject of Palestine. On the other hand, it was quite impossible for him, as it was impossible for the Congress, to ignore so generous an action on the part of a leading Government. Even if the offer were not acceptable, courtesy—not to speak of political exigency—demanded some decision.

In what light Herzl regarded the offer, it is impossible to say. It would be indiscreet to go behind his own public and solemn statements; we

must wait until his Memoirs are published for complete light upon the subject. But it is permissible to conjecture that he recognized its value not only intrinsically but also as a political weapon to be used in other quarters. The negotiations which he had been conducting in Constantinople seemed to have reached a blind alley. The offers made to him by the Sultan at various times were such as he could not accept. The proposition of the English Government might perhaps open the eye of the Sultan to the fact that places other than Palestine were possible for a Jewish "home." And then he had the hope that, should a suitable spot be found, other forces in Jewry might join in the effort, or perhaps do the work themselves after the way had been pointed out to them. In point of fact, the Jewish Colonization Association did at first seem disposed to lend a helping hand. It withdrew, however, upon the specious plea that the English Government had made too liberal an offer, and that the political and economic autonomy suggested vitiated the whole scheme.

Those who were present at the Sixth Congress remember well the mutterings that presaged the storm. In his masterly and carefully-worded opening address, Herzl presented the offer with proper

words of recognition. He tried to make it clear that this was not an alternative for Palestine, that East Africa could not be Zion, and Nordau coined the expression *Nachtasyl* as defining the use to which such a settlement might be put. But the Congress, by a large majority, would have none of it. The opposition was made up of the Democratic Fraction, nearly all the Russians, the Chovevi Zionists, and even some of the closest friends of Doctor Herzl. The minority was composed of some nationalists in whom the old ideas still remained alive, and of benevolent Zionists who were only lukewarm political followers of Herzl. It was perfectly evident that, if a vote on the question itself had been taken at the Sixth Congress, the offer would have been rejected with no uncertain voice. But any decision at that moment would have been ill-considered. An acrimonious agitation had arisen, and the judgment of both partisans and opponents was warped and prejudiced by sentiment. Nor was there any assurance that the part of the Protectorate in view was at all suited for colonization by Europeans. The country had been imperfectly surveyed and studied from an agronomic and economic point of view. Manifestly, the one proper course to take was to send a com-

mission of inquiry, upon the basis of whose report an intelligent estimate could be made of the real value of the whole offer. Such a line of conduct would also comport with the dignity of all the factors involved. It would stave off a brusque refusal of a magnanimous proposal, and it would allow the hand of time to calm the impassioned enthusiasm of both sides. The proposition was accepted by a substantial majority, in spite of a large number who abstained from voting at all. Provision was also made for a special meeting of delegates at the next Congress, at which the report of the commission should be discussed.

It is necessary to insist upon the subject of this vote; for with the obstinacy of set purpose the seeming of things has been represented as a fact, and members of the Congress themselves have maintained that this was a vote upon the offer itself. Even after the Congress had gone apart, the confusion persisted; and no less an authority than Israel Zangwill has affirmed that the sentiment of the delegates was clearly in favor of the proposition. The stenographic report of the Congress is sufficient evidence how mistaken this view is. The Congress was, in its largest part, strongly opposed to acceptance; it marked its opposition by passing a

resolution prohibiting the use of any Shekel moneys or of any property of the Trust for the purposes of the expedition. The Russian members of the Central Committee (Actions Committee) went still further, and made a demonstration by publicly quitting the Congress session together with some of their Russian fellow-delegates.

The commission which went out to East Africa in December, 1903, made its report to the Central Committee in May, 1904. The territory examined and delimited by the British Government at Herzl's request comprised an area covering some six thousand square miles, and was known as the Guas Ngishu Plateau. Although the members of the commission did not agree upon all points, the general view seemed to be that the territory would be insufficient for any large number of Jewish settlers, and that the ground was fit rather for grazing than for agriculture. In addition, a strong opposition to the grant had developed in the East African Protectorate itself. Telegrams from Lord Delamere, the High Commissioner of British East Africa, from Lord Hindlipp, and from Sir H. H. Johnston arrived at the Foreign Office couched in terms that showed the difficulties such a settlement would have

had to encounter."[10] All this was meat for the Palestinian enthusiasts.

In addition several lines of cleavage were beginning to show themselves within the ranks of the Congressists. Perhaps it is wrong to put it in this way. The lines had, in reality, existed from the very beginning of the movement. It was the East African project that accentuated them and made them very apparent. Under normal conditions, a strong and determined Opposition is as essential in a Parliament, into which the Congress had developed, as is a Government party. It has the double function of keeping a close watch upon the leaders in power and of taking the rudder at the moment a change is desired or becomes necessary. But Jewish conditions have never been normal since the suppression of Jewish statehood, and the circumstances under which the Zionist movement had grown would have made a change of horses while in the stream a most precarious undertaking. Zionism was still in the formative period of its growth. Its very existence was at times dubious. For its building up it needed the combined efforts of all parties. The East African project, acting as a divisor, was most unfortunate in its sequel.

During the sessions of the Sixth Congress, a

Jewish Congress had been held in Palestine. In ordinary circumstances such a gathering would have been viewed by all Zionists with satisfaction, and been accompanied by their applause. But it had been organized and it was presided over by Michael Ussischkin. He was one of the old Russian Zionist leaders, a man of much merit and with a considerable following, but he had little sympathy with the political and tactical methods of Herzl. He was and he remained a Chovevi Zionist; and the organization which this Congress proposed, and which was to include representatives of Baron Edmond de Rothschild and of the Odessa Committee, the Jewish Colonization Association, the Alliance Israélite, and the Ezra, shows that its object was antagonistic to that of the Zionist Congresses, and was intended rather as a substitute than as a supplement.

Most of the Russian leaders went even further than this. They broke out into what was practical rebellion. Those of them who were members of the Central Committee met at Kharkoff in October, 1903, and determined to found a committee of their own within the Central Committee. They further agreed to demand from Herzl a written promise to relinquish the East African project

prior to the convening of the Seventh Congress and, in his capacity of leader of the Zionists, to engage in no further territorial schemes. In addition, he was to be required to make a formal promise to take up the work in Palestine and further the acquisition of land there and in Syria with the moneys of the National Fund. A threat was also attached to the promises demanded—supplies were to be withheld from Vienna in case of a refusal. This was an all too evident attempt to force Herzl's hand and, by means of caucus rule, to limit the free exercise of the will of the majority in the Congress. When these various proceedings became known, much indignation was expressed at the methods that had been adopted and the want of tact exhibited, due no doubt to a combination of lack of experience and excess of zeal. The excitement made its way into other quarters, notably into England, where a cross-current of local English patriotism in favor of the British offer came in to trouble the waters still more. By a sort of tacit understanding, however, the resolutions of the Kharkoff Conference were permitted to drop out of sight, and nothing further was heard of the new organization projected in Palestine. In the meantime, the Zionist leader had closed his eyes,

worn out by the struggles of the last years and exhausted by the storm of which he had been the center, one may say innocently. Though he had been harshly and unjustly treated, his generous nature bore no malice. He was even filled with admiration that those for whom in the first instance the relief measure had been projected should spurn it because it seemed to involve a divergence from their ideal.

The Seventh Congress, of 1905, was to decide upon the East African offer. The Russians had taken time by the forelock, and, at a conference held at Vilna (January 14, 1905), had expressed the view that any attempt at colonization outside of Palestine "was opposed to both the historical ideal of Zionism and to the Basel Platform." The conclusion arrived at by the special Congress of July 30 was foregone. The coalition comprising the Government Party, the Ziyyone Zionists, and the Mizrachi Fraction were known to be in a large majority. I quote in full the final resolution that brought to an end the discussion on the subject within the ranks of the Congress:

The Seventh Zionist Congress declares: The Zionist organization stands firmly by the fundamental principle of the Basel

Program, namely, "The establishment of a legally-secured, publicly-recognized home for the Jewish people in Palestine," and it rejects, either as an end or as a means of colonizing, activity outside Palestine and its adjacent lands. The Congress resolves to thank the British Government for its offer of a territory in British East Africa, for the purpose of establishing there a Jewish settlement with autonomous rights. A commission having been sent out to examine the territory, and having reported thereon, the Congress resolves that the Zionist organization shall not engage itself further with the proposal. The Congress records with satisfaction the recognition accorded by the British Government to the Zionist organization in its desire to bring about a solution of the Jewish problem, and expresses a sincere hope that it may be accorded the further good offices of the British Government where available in any matter it may undertake in accordance with the Basel Program. The Seventh Zionist Congress recalls and emphasizes the fact that, according to article 1 of the statutes of the Zionist organization, the Zionist organization includes those Jews who declare themselves to be in agreement with the Basel Program.

The wound which had been inflicted could not be healed by a simple resolution. The minority did not disarm. Most of the territorialists had abstained from taking part in the final vote, and the Poale Zion, who were to a large extent advanced socialists, marked their complete disapprobation by refusing to participate further in the proceedings of the Congress. It was these two bodies that

formed the nucleus of the first real and effective split in the Zionist organization.

The premonitory signs of this secession were seen in 1905, when the Zionistic Territorial Organization in Berne first made its appearance. The British offer in East Africa and the difference of opinion in regard to its acceptance formed the occasion for its active manifestation. It gained greatly in importance by the fact that Israel Zangwill put himself at its head. By the power of his pen and by a devotion similar to that of his friend Herzl, he has been able to build it up in a manner not thought possible by those who witnessed its birth. The object of this organization, or Ito,[11] as it has come to be called, is:

1. To procure a territory upon an autonomous basis for the Jews who cannot or who will not remain in the lands in which they already live. 2. To achieve this end, the organization proposes: to unite all Jews who are in agreement with this object; to enter into relations with governments and public and private institutions; and to create financial institutions, labor bureaus, and other instruments that may be found necessary.

One would wish to speak with all due reserve in criticism of a writer and leader who has deserved so well of the Jewish people as Israel Zangwill. Yet the public utterances and the public acts of even

the greatest are legitimate subjects for public criticism. The mental evolution of Zangwill in regard to Zionism has been peculiar. One is led to doubt whether he was ever a real Zionist in the full acceptation of the term. The enthusiastic selflessness with which he loved his people and their history led him to be a follower of Herzl upon part of the road. He had come to the First Congress merely as a spectator, and was drawn into the strong current that it produced.[12] He followed the leader's development into a Palestinian Zionist, and remained so up to the Sixth Congress. His brilliant pen has written many an impassioned praise of Palestine and of its possibilities under Jewish leadership. "He that owns no land is no man," he cited from the Talmud at the head of an article full of fine sentiments and careful statistics about Palestine.[13] He was of opinion that "George Eliot, the great seer, pierced into the heart of the question with keener vision than any Jew," and he described aptly the attitude of many Zionists when he wrote, "We have followed the largely unconscious evolution by which—even against his will—Israel's feet have been turned Zionwards at the very moment in history it is possible for him to reoccupy the country for the world's benefit and his

own." And he adds: "But the dullest imagination must feel what a world of romance and spiritual hope, what a ferment of religious revival and literary and artistic activity, must attend and follow the home-coming of the Jew." At the Fifth Congress he uttered a noteworthy protest against the pusillanimous leaders of the Jewish Colonization Association and the Alliance Israélite Universelle, in the course of which he said:[14] "In the year 68, when Titus hovered round Jerusalem, the father of anti-Zionism, Johanan ben Zakkai, escaped from the Holy City in a coffin, and fled to the Roman camp. He had persuaded himself Jews could live without a country, by Torah alone. To-night, eighteen hundred and thirty-three years later, I stand here and see the delegates from all the lands of the Exile who still cry, 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning.'" And he has sent broadcast into the Jewish world such cries as, "Give the country without a people to the people without a country."

At the beginning of the Territorialist propaganda, Zangwill still spoke well of Zionism, holding that one could become an Itoist and remain a Zionist. Nevertheless he was sharply attacked by his former colleagues; but this attack does not

excuse his ever-increasing opposition to a movement which he had helped to expand. Legitimate criticism on his part degenerated into open antagonism. He was the prime mover against the Jewish Colonial Trust when it attempted to carry out a resolution of the Congress and to change its statutes for the purpose of preventing the use of Zionist moneys for any other than strictly Zionist purposes. Of course, Zangwill hoped that at some time or other the moneys might become available for the purposes of the Ito, but the place to carry through such a project or to safeguard the future was in the Congress itself and not before a court of law. The action was costly, and injurious to the good fame of all concerned in it. It is a subject of reproach to him that, though in 1900 and in 1904 he publicly labored the idea that the minority must perforce give way to the majority,[15] in 1905 he acted directly contrary to such advice, and that, instead of stepping out quietly from a movement when he found himself no longer in sympathy with it, he chose to become one of its chief opponents and critics.

It would be invidious to criticise any movement that makes a serious attempt to solve some of the problems that confront the Jew. In the present

state of Eastern European Jewry, no endeavor ought to be made to block any practical work that is being done to lighten its burden. It is not with what the Germans call Schadenfreude that one records the repeated failure of the Ito to find a territory fit for Jewish colonization, whether in the Cyrenaica, in Canada, in Australia, in Mesopotamia, or in Angola. It is with sincere regret that the fact is borne in upon us that no land seems available for such a purpose. But from the more extended Zionist point of view Itoism is like the play with the principal character taken out: it is Zionism minus Zion. It has undoubtedly earned much praise for its attempt to regulate emigration from Eastern Europe and deflect part of it through Galveston to the Southern states of North America. It has grouped around a distinctively Jewish standard some of the best forces in English and Continental Jewry. But it is just these forces that have led it further and further away from its original ideals. It does not insist with the same vehemence upon the autonomy of the colonization it wishes to effect: indeed, some of its most ardent supporters are determined opponents of autonomy in any form whatsoever. To the outsider, therefore, it appears to be falling back into the old idea

of helping Jewish wants and needs by benevolence. Well and scientifically though this benevolence may be applied, it has yet emasculated the greater hope with which Pinsker, Rülf, Herzl, and others had fired the Jewish world.

But entirely apart from such considerations, it is pertinent to remark that the further and systematic dispersion of Jews must act unfavorably on the whole body, and can only be entertained as a last resort—*faute de mieux*. This, of course, is a point of view which may well appeal to those of us who do not live under political and economic pressure, but which we cannot press upon those who do not enjoy the same privileged position. In a general and somewhat theoretical way, it may be held that the Zionist organization as such ought to have no official connection with movements based upon the principle of further dispersion. In this sense, the whole discussion on emigration at the Tenth Congress was entirely out of place.

[Notes, pp. 225-226]

CHAPTER VI

THE POST-HERZLIAN PERIOD

The death of Herzl robbed the young movement of the great personality around which it had gathered; it took away its foremost representative to the outer world. No such eventuality had been envisaged by Herzl himself, though some of his more intimate friends had tried to induce him to look for a successor. Their efforts had been abortive, the poetic optimism of the leader had calmed all suspicion in his own mind in regard to his physical weakness. To his followers, his loss brought consternation; from his critics and from opponents of the cause, a flood of prophecies that the end of Zionism was close at hand. These prophecies might have proved true, if Zionism had been simply a one-man's theory and the work of a single individual. In that case, however spectacular its expression and however promising its outlook, it would inevitably have crumbled to pieces and been lost in the sands of time. But Herzl's work was

merely the culminating point in a development that was the most determined expression of Jewish vitality. As he had not called Zionism into existence—however much he had aided its growth—his disappearance could not annihilate it. To fill his place in any adequate manner, it was clearly felt, would be quite impossible: he united in his person certain qualities that do not often commingle in one and the same individual. Various devices have been adopted to fill Herzl's place by a commission, sometimes of three, at other times of seven. The plain fact is that Zionism is still awaiting the appearance of one man who by common consent is fitted to sit in his seat.

In another respect also Herzl's death produced a change. The center of Zionist activity had very naturally been in the place of his permanent abode. Vienna possessed certain natural advantages even beyond this fortuitous circumstance. It was easy of access from Russia, the great backbone of the movement; it was a sort of half-way house to Constantinople, the center of Herzl's political negotiations. But it was not a spot favorable for active Jewish propaganda. The conflict of nationalities in Austria had had a deleterious effect upon the Jews. They had been drawn, willy-nilly,

into the maelstrom of inner Austrian politics; in one district they had been forced to take sides with one grouping, in another, to flock to the opposing standard. Nor must it be forgotten that the Jewish representatives in Vienna had been particularly hostile to Herzl and to the other Zionist leaders, and that the atmosphere was decidedly unfriendly. Herzl had a " bad press " in his own city, and with his passing the center of gravity was bound to move elsewhere.

There could be little doubt to which part of Europe the move would be made. For a short while London was debated, but London was the seat of the Jewish Colonial Trust, and it was a wise forethought not to concentrate all the Zionist institutions in one locality. In addition, Jewish nationalism and the modern Zionist movement had been born on the Continent. To have given them an Anglo-Saxon coloring might have added still another difficulty and another subject of disunion to the many that existed already. German was still the language understood, in one form or another, by the largest number of Jews. Germany was clearly marked out as the future home of the movement. Not only was Cologne the home of two of the leaders and closest friends of Herzl. Ger-

many had, by a peculiar development, earned a fully-written title to the distinction.

Nothing is perhaps so remarkable as the manner in which this title was acquired. During the early years of Zionism, the strongest protests and pronouncements had come from this very Germany. Laymen, clerics, and intellectuals had joined hands in condemnation. Germany was the cradle of the Reform movement, the principles of which were the antithesis of those upon which Zionism was based. To the Reformers, Zionism represented a sort of *lèse majesté,* and some of the leaders were willing to go any length to stamp it out. But there were many Russian and Roumanian Jewish students at German universities; a number of them were nationalists, who interpreted their nationalism in a cultural sense. They commenced to study Jewish history, to get into touch with the Jewish past, to sound the soul of their birthright. Modern in their way of thinking, they began to infuse a Jewish spirit into their modernism and to have visions of a Jewish culture of the future; to dream of Jewish art, of Jewish music, and the like. Vigorous in body as they were strong in mind, they had founded their own Verbindungen. Their answer to the attempt to keep them out of associa-

tion with the highest advances of German development in the arts and sciences was virile: it led to self-communion and to self-concentration.

This whole movement had commenced in German Austria at the time of the first extensive pogroms in Russia, in 1882, when the Kadimah was founded at the University of Vienna. Its name in its double signification, "Onwards-Eastwards," had been the suggestion of Perez Smolenskin. Its text-book was Pinsker's *Autoemancipation*. At the outset, its membership was composed largely of Russian students; these were joined by Galicians and Roumanians. Very naturally, it was looked at askance and with some suspicion by Jewish students of German Austria. Such a Jewish assertion as it represented was quite foreign to their own nature and to their surroundings. But Vienna soon became a hotbed of anti-Semitism, and the university its chief breeding-place. The emphasis with which the Jewish cause was defended by the Kadimah soon brought it adherents from among the German-raised Jewish students. Above all, it became a meeting-ground for Jewish university men coming from different lands, on which the Westerners learned for the first time that their own problems were in reality similar to those of the

Jewries further East. That the soil was amply prepared for such student-societies is evident from the fact that the Kadimah became the model for a number of similar organizations, not only at the Vienna University, but also at Prague, Czernowitz, Brünn, Lemberg, Gratz, Bielitz, and Suczawa. Many of the societies undertook to cultivate the Hebrew language; some of them had a strong nationalist tendency; and it was the Kadimah, as we have seen, that was the first Jewish group to extend a welcoming hand to Doctor Herzl.[1]

It was natural that the foundation of such societies at the German University of Vienna should have a repercussion in Germany itself. At about the same time began the attempt to exclude Jewish students from the academic societies in German universities. The action of the Akademische Lesehalle in Berlin was answered by the opening of the Jüdische Lesehalle. The first German Jewish Students' Society was formed in 1886 (Viadrina, in Breslau, now Thuringia). Since then a surprisingly large number of such societies have been established, in Berlin, Breslau, Darmstadt, Freiburg, Königsberg, Marburg, Munich, Bonn, and Strassburg. The variety and the multiformity of these societies are the best warrant that they satisfy

an inner and irrepressible need. The first were founded frankly with the purpose of combating anti-Semitism by strengthening the Jewish consciousness of their members. They are united in what is called a Kartell-Konvent, and take no sides in political or religious questions. The Kartell was soon followed by the Bund jüdischer Korporationen (1900), which went one step further, and turned the rather negative program of the Kartell into one more positive, for the purpose of "developing a living Judaism." None of the societies in the above-mentioned groups was distinctly Zionistic or even Jewishly national. The first official Zionistic students' society was the Maccabaea, in Breslau (1901). It has been followed by several others, which have been gathered into a Kartell zionistischer Verbindungen, founded in 1906. To these must be added the Academic-Zionistic Society Tchioh, founded in Köthen, in 1903, which has, from time to time, instituted summer courses in the history and geography of Palestine; the Freie Verbindung Dahlemia (Berlin, 1905-1906), made up of students of pharmacy; and the Bund jüdischer Akademiker (1906), in Berlin, Munich, and Strassburg, whose object is to strengthen traditional Judaism among university students.[2] And, finally,

mention must be made of the Bund jüdischer Jugendvereine, a sort of by-product of the students' societies. Though this Bund is not distinctly Zionistic in its program, most of its members come from Zionist circles. The organization is said to contain thirteen thousand members, and is similar in its tendencies to the Young Judaea in America.[3]

I have dwelt somewhat upon these societies, because they have brought into the bonds of the closest ideal friendship a number of young men, who have acted as leaven both within the university and without. That there was need of such a strengthened dike, upon which the waves of anti-Semitism were to beat, was all too evident. Many of the older dikes had not held; they had given way gradually, either through pressure from without or through weakness from within. The alarming number of conversions to Christianity that took place in Germany during the closing years of the nineteenth and the opening years of the twentieth century, show plainly the need for a deeper Jewish consciousness. It will be remembered that at the time of Germany's greatest political degradation, consequent upon the Napoleonic régime, the new spirit that was to bring freedom was born and nurtured in the universities. Quite a similar idealism

proceeded from among the Jewish students a little less than a hundred years later, and prepared the way for the definite leadership assumed by the German Zionists in 1911, when the seat of the Inner Actions Committee was fixed in Berlin, and when Professor Otto Warburg was chosen by his colleagues to preside over the Committee.

This change in the place of the central governing body denoted also a certain change in policy, or, to be more just, a greater accentuation of one part of Zionist activity. The old rivalry between the two lines along which the movement had been conducted had become accentuated as years went by. It had become somewhat stereotyped by the designation of the one as " political " Zionism and of the other as " Palestinian " Zionism. The designations were false, and therefore the stereotyping was a misfortune. At best, no essential antagonism existed between the two policies, not even any appreciable gulf between one and the other. There were, of course, extremists on both sides, but the question was largely one of proportion only. The arch-" politicals " held fast to the formulae which Herzl had laid down at the beginning of his Zionist career; they still believed that it was wrong and unwise to forward colonization before full political

guarantees had been secured; they looked askance at what was called "petty colonization" (Klein-Kolonisation) and at any extensive application of the funds of the Jewish Colonial Trust to the purchase of land in Palestine. They conceived Zionism along large lines, and counseled a waiting policy until the time should come when really decisive and thoroughgoing action would be possible —unconsciously nearing, though upon quite different grounds, the position held by the ultra-Orthodox wing of the Synagogue. But to describe them as anti-Palestinians would be to mistake a method of procedure for a matter of principle. Again, there were also extreme Palestinians, the so-called Ziyyone Zionists. These were impatient of delay in furthering what was called "practical work" in Palestine, and some even went so far as to demand the transference of the whole movement, bag and baggage, to the Promised Land.[4] It is true that such showed a want of political perspicacity, but most of their leaders had in no way broken with the political side of Zionism. They simply believed that this feature was of secondary importance, one which, in some unknown way, would take care of itself.

It was these extreme Palestinians who were, in

a measure, to carry the day. Originally, they were a group composed mostly of Russians, at whose head was M. Ussischkin. They were admirably organized, and they were among the most determined of those who had opposed the East Africa proposition. Ussischkin had been the moving spirit at the all-Russian Zionist Congress at Minsk, September, 1902, at which the proposition was made to invest in Palestine land the whole of the sums collected for the National Fund. In the year 1903 he had convened a Zionist Congress in Palestine itself, as related above, and during the last years of Herzl's life he had been his opponent, antagonizing him secretly and openly. After Herzl's death, the Russian opposition grew in power; their representatives at the Congress were assisted by the German contingent, much of whose interest lay more exclusively in Jewish developments in Palestine than in the larger questions at issue. During the period 1904-1911, when the Zionist organization was under the leadership of David Wolffsohn, who had taken the ungracious task upon his shoulders of heading the movement in the most critical period in its development, they had made rapid strides. Wolffsohn's efforts were largely expended—and necessarily so—in healing the many breaches made

in its walls. At the Congress of 1911 the combination of Russians and Germans won its final victory, and passed from the Opposition to the Government benches. Its policy is expressed in the words used by Professor Warburg at the Seventh Congress: "Their right to the land by reason of their having possessed it two thousand years ago is not a sufficient claim; they must create a modern title, which would consist in the fact that Palestine depended economically upon the Jews, owing its progress to Jewish initiative and resources."[5] It is Professor Warburg who has given practical expression to this policy in his character as founder and chairman of the Palestine Commission. Under his auspices, the Commission has assisted various Palestinian enterprises, and has encouraged the formation of a number of societies that collect information regarding the agricultural and commercial possibilities of the country.[6] It is practically the Palestine Commission which now guides the Zionist movement.

Though it has been felt by many Zionists that the work projected by the Commission—and now, presumably, to be followed by the organization—is of too varied a character, and sometimes beyond the immediate means, the work of the Pales-

tine Commission has always commanded interest. It provided opportunity for willing hands, and material, other than pure theorems, with which to fix on Palestine the interest of the ever-widening Diaspora. It represented action, and the ordinary man looks upon action, of whatever kind it may be, as the final warrant of success. In addition, it made it possible to rally to its assistance other elements in Jewish life than merely affiliated Zionists: some whose attitude was one of sympathetic detachment, others who refused to follow the decadent lead of Jewish cravens. For the claim of Palestine has always found more or less of an echo in the heart of the Jew, however much he might be estranged from the current life of his people. Historical, sentimental, and benevolent instincts joined hands to produce this result. The Technical School at Haifa, the Hebrew Gymnasium at Jaffa, the Jewish Agricultural Experiment Station at Athlit, and the Bezalel School at Jerusalem, though all the outcome of Zionist impulse, are cases in point. These would hardly have been possible without the substantial aid of many who would object to being classed in any of the categories into which Zionists may be divided. The great danger, however, lies in the possible one-sided

insistence on this work as the quintessence of Zionism. Unless it is informed with the ideal represented by the so-called "politicals," it is, indeed, in danger of falling back into the rut of Chovevi Zionism and of running into the sands of mere benevolence a movement that at one time quivered with national sentiment. It is the duty of the present Opposition to keep this larger view alive.

The new direction given to the Zionist movement has been strangely favored by historic events in Turkey itself. The regranting of the Constitution, forced upon the late Sultan Abdul Hamid in 1908, and confirmed after the counter-revolution in 1909, was bound to have its effect in Palestine and react upon the Zionist movement. During the absolutist régime of the former Sultan, it was possible for Herzl to treat with the Sultan alone. Nearly all the power in the state had been concentrated gradually in the Palace, to the exclusion of the Porte and to the derision of so-called responsible ministers. The Constitution took this power out of the hands of the Sultan, and gave it back to the people, or at least to their parliamentary representatives. It is quite evident that a procedure that promised success under the old order, would require modification under the new. Different forces had to be con-

CERTIFICATE OF AN INSCRIPTION IN THE GOLDEN BOOK OF THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND

sidered, and attention had to be given to the power of public opinion.

It has been repeated with insistence that with the change of Government at Constantinople Charterism was dead, and as Charterism was set up as the equivalent of Zionism, the inference was drawn that Zionism was dead. But Charterism was merely a method, and was in no way of the essence of the movement. Charterism was a possibility under a system that was personal in character, when, for personal, if not for state, reasons, such an arrangement might seem advantageous to some ulterior plan of the ruler. But new forces were at work now, and these forces demanded recognition. The emotion that accompanied the new order of things had produced a wave of patriotism among Turkish subjects unknown hitherto, which looked with disfavor upon any special groupings according to nationalities and races. The attempt was to be made to "Ottomanize" everything. The definite incorporation of Bosnia and Herzegovina into the Austro-Hungarian Empire (1908), the proclamation of the independence of Bulgaria, and the attempt of the Cretans to secure their junction to the Hellenic kingdom served only to fan the flame. It was obviously not the moment to push

whatever claims the Jews might have to urge in Palestine, but simply to work there for the upbuilding of the country and for the economic and cultural strengthening of the Jewish position in the land. In addition, it was necessary to clarify the situation and enlighten the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress upon the real ends and aims of Zionism.

Unfortunately, this enlightening process has not been carried very far, despite the fact that in 1907 a daughter-institution of the Jewish Colonial Trust had been established at Constantinople itself, the Anglo-Levantine Company, for the express purpose of facilitating such enlightenment. Certain currents hostile to the Zionists and to the Jewish colonists in Palestine had commenced to make their appearance, with the evident intention to prejudice the minds of responsible statesmen in the capital. Some of the German colonists in the neighborhood of Jaffa had not seen with a welcoming eye the success of their Jewish fellow-colonists and the forward movement of the Jews in Jaffa and Haifa. A series of letters published in the Ottomanischer Lloyd at Constantinople[7] gave tongue to these complaints, and the voice was heard in the high places. In addition, the Arabs were becoming, or

were said to be becoming, restless. Certain Syrian agitators thought to push their claims by means of an anti-Jewish campaign in a penny-sheet published at Haifa.[8] More unfortunately still, a certain support was given to this misconstruction by Jewish bodies themselves. In characteristic fashion, the Jews in Constantinople and in other parts of Turkey in Europe were for the most part ultra-Turkish in their sympathies, and, in a situation in which every nationality—Greek, Bulgarian, Kutzo-Vlach, Albanian, Servian, and Arab—was asserting its righteous (and sometimes unrighteous) claims, the Jews alone remained silent. They had bound themselves hand and foot to the Committee of Union and Progress. Nor can certain elements in West European Jewry be absolved from all blame for actions which can hardly be the result of pure ignorance. In 1910 a deputation of the Committee of Union and Progress had come to Paris. It was quite natural that the leaders of the Alliance Israélite should seek to get into closest touch with the Turkish authorities, in view of the many educational institutions supported by them in the Ottoman Empire. But they seem to have insinuated into the minds of the members of the deputation the idea that Zionism was incompatible with

Ottomanism—an idea that was actively propagated through Alliance channels in Turkey itself.[9] In this manner, an atmosphere of suspicion was created, in which all sorts of rumors had a chance to take root and flourish. This was fully revealed in the Turkish Parliament, during the autumn of 1910 and the spring of 1911, when the conduct of Djavid Bey, the former Minister of Finance, was under review.

Djavid Bey is by birth a Dönmeh, a descendant of those followers of Sabbataï Zebi who saved themselves by conforming outwardly to Mohammedan rites; in other words, an Islamic Marano. In order to discredit him completely, European methods had been imported into Turkey, and the Jewish financial bogy evoked, of which he was said to be the tool. This bubble agitation succeeded in a measure, and with fatuous credulity was published *urbi et orbi* by the correspondent of the London Times at Vienna.[10] The severe attack leveled at the Hakki ministry issued often in the charge of "Judaizing," savoring strongly of Inquisition days and Inquisition methods. The words "Zionism" and "Zionist" were used freely in this harrying process, and, in defending them-

selves against any such suspicion, both Djavid Bey and Hakki Pasha displayed such ignorance of the first principles of the movement as to raise the suspicion that they had heard of it then and there for the first time. The charges were in a nutshell that Zionism was a world-wide Jewish intrigue against Ottoman statehood, behind which some great Jewish banking-houses of international fame were seeking to gain their own ends. Such muddle-headedness might be excusable among the penny-a-liners of the daily press, but it was quite inexcusable at the bar of a nation's assembly. The one or two Jewish deputies who intervened achieved the wonderful performance of bemusing the confusion still further.[11]

Now, upon no point had so much insistence been put by Zionist leaders as upon the relation of the movement to Ottoman sovereignty. In the pre-Herzlian period, Pinsker[12] had insisted upon a proper and faithful understanding with Constantinople. Ahad ha-Am had followed him in this.[13] At the very first Congress, in 1897, Herzl had set the seal upon an open and loyal intercourse with the Turkish authorities, and his disapprobation of any procedure that might awaken distrust led him

to object to Palestine-colonization as it had been carried on previously. His words were:[14]

The confidence of the state which is necessary for a settlement of large masses of Jews can only be gained by publicity and by loyal action. . . . The immigration of the Jews is an influx in force of an unexpected wealth for this poor country, yes, even for the whole Ottoman Empire. His Majesty, the Sultan, has had the best of experiences of his Jewish subjects, just as he has always been towards them a kind sovereign.

At the Third Congress, Herzl again emphasized the point in his opening address:[15]

Naturally we lay the strongest stress on giving proof of this loyalty, above all to the Turkish Government. No step will be taken by us which even in a remote degree could arouse the justifiable mistrust of the sovereign power of Palestine. We will and can confer the greatest advantages on the Ottoman Empire; we may act altogether openly.

Again, at the Seventh Congress, Nordau reiterated, and in no uncertain words, the attitude of the Zionist leaders:[16]

In these circumstances, the Turkish Government might realize that it would be of great value to possess, in Palestine and Syria, a numerous, strong, and well-organized population, which, with due regard to the rights of the indigenous peoples, would tolerate no attacks on the authority of the Sultan, but on the contrary would repel them with all its power. And Europe would probably regard it as a service if the Jewish people, by its peaceful

and energetic occupation of Palestine, prevents violent changes in the government of the country, and renders superfluous an intervention of the Powers, the dangers of which are only too well-known in diplomatic circles.

At the Eighth Congress, David Wolffsohn again took up the thread, and, addressing the Porte through the Congress, spoke of the "loyalty of our endeavors and the civilizing and peaceful character of our movement which had been laid to the heart of the Porte: we have continually represented to the Turkish Government the loyalty of our aspirations, the civilizing and peaceful significance of our undertakings, and we hope that the Sublime Porte, which entertains great sympathy for our people, will find the correct measure for the estimate of our intentions." "

Such citations could easily be multiplied. They all show plainly that the Zionists conceived their mission as in no way hostile to Ottoman statehood. Considering the downward pace at which things were going during the reign of Abdul Hamid, and the probable break-up of the Empire that this foreshadowed, it was natural that the largest possible measure of autonomy figured in the Zionist program for the future Jewish home. Modern constitutionalism in Turkey has diminished the neces-

sity of insistence upon the political side of this autonomy. It is true that the bloom of the new life there has been somewhat hectic in its flush. It demanded too much. It attempted to sink all differences of race and nationality in the all-embracing arms of Ottomanism. Such a policy is impossible of success in Turkey. Nay, it is directly opposed to the fundamental principles of Mohammedan political doctrines, which distinctly permit the existence of separate entities, bound together by a common allegiance to the state power. The only hope for the future prosperity of the Ottoman Empire lies in a wise and wide decentralization, in which the various races, nationalities, and religions shall be able to develop their innate powers, and along their own peculiar lines. The second and sober thought of Turkish statesmen is veering gradually to this policy—a policy put forward with a strong plea by Prince Sabaheddin at the Congress of the opposition parties held in Paris in 1907, and to advance which the party of the "Entente" has been formed. As a member of such a reorganized state, a Jewish Palestine will take its due and proper place.

[Notes, pp. 226-227]

CHAPTER VII

SOME PHASES OF ZIONISTIC THEORY

It is natural that a movement which made its appeal to Jews in every land, and was consciously meant to be " all-Jewish " in its application, should receive different and varying interpretations. Perhaps the very fact that it has been interpreted variously might be cited in support of the contention that it is the very heart of the Jewish question as felt by the Jews themselves. With some of these interpretations we are already acquainted, especially with the two most important ones: that put forward by Herzl and his immediate followers, and termed " political," and that represented by the so-called Palestinians. Some phases in the development of Zionism were only momentary in their appearance, and due either to special circumstances or to personal considerations. A few phases, however, are of larger import and deserve special mention.

The first of these phases is that represented by the Poale Zion. As their name signifies, they represent the Labor Party within the Zionist organiza-

tion. The untoward condition in which Jewish laborers live, not only in the modern Ghettos of Eastern Europe, but also in the large cities of Western Europe and America, has made their attachment to the Zionist cause somewhat natural. They have suffered along with others in the same social class under the rapid and haphazard development of our great modern industrial centers. The fact of their being Jews has, however, added to their difficulties in Eastern Europe, and, when they emigrated, the fact that they are strangers in the land of their adoption. The legislation of the Middle Ages had forced them into a few and definite occupations, and, as land-tenure by Jews was prohibited, agricultural employment was entirely impossible. An unhealthy one-sidedness was thus developed, of which they themselves were only too well aware. At first, there was every indication that they would join hands with the Socialists, and find rest and respite in their camp. For their attachment to the Jewish cause, either religious or national, was not known to be strong. Socialism has always been more or less of a revolt against the domination of religious influences, such influences having been represented as one of the forces of capitalism. Nor have the Socialists anywhere been strong nation-

alists, despite the facts that individual Socialists have expressed strong nationalist sentiments, and the German Socialists have of late years refused to follow their French colleagues in the endeavor to break down the barriers that separate one nation from another.[1] The Socialism of Marx, however, is thoroughly international in spirit; the celebrated manifesto of Marx and Engels (1848) says expressly that the workman has no fatherland.[2] The Jewish Socialist and labor parties should have had no reason to look beyond the party in which their fellow-workmen were to be found.

That this has not been so, is only one of the many curious phenomena that accompany and signalize the history of the Jews. The chief founder of modern Socialism, Karl Marx, is a Jew. Singer and Bernstein, to name only two of the more prominent leaders, are also Jews. But the Socialists were as unwilling as others to take up the cause of their persecuted fellow-proletarians. Shortly after the Kishineff disaster, in 1905, a monster-meeting of protest was held in Hyde Park, London. The Socialists, however, refused to join in the demonstration,[3] just as the peasants and workingmen in Russia have declined to make common cause with their Jewish fellow-citizens.[4]

In Germany and Austria, the Christian-Socialist Party, evidently intended to turn Socialists away from their international and anti-religious dreams, made a juncture with Jewish laborers impossible. In this manner, the Jewish workingman was forced to throw in his lot with his own brethren. It is interesting to note that Moses Hess, a staunch worker in the Socialist cause, was a prophet of modern Zionism.

The beginnings of the Poale Zion group go back to the so-called Democratic Fraction, which was formed at a time shortly preceding the Fifth Congress. Its members were in a certain sense followers of Ahad ha-Am, but they laid more stress than he upon the proper and successful development of the Palestinian center of which he wrote, more particularly in the direction of the broadest democracy. The grouping was short-lived, though represented at the all-Russian Zionist Congress held at Minsk in 1902. After the Fifth Congress, it sank its identity in the party of the Poale Zion. This latter had its origin in Russia, in 1901, whence it spread into Austria, America, and Palestine. In 1909, the various territorial societies formed themselves into an international combination, in which the attempt was made to square Socialism

with Zionism. As Zionists they take sides neither with the "politicals" nor with the "practicals," but lay stress upon what they call the social-economic side of the work in Palestine. They start from the principle that a people, whether in the majority or in the minority, can make its influence felt permanently only when it is attached to the ground on which it lives, and actually tills this ground. They believe that the great evil from which the Jews have suffered in the Diaspora has been this estrangement from the land, not simply estrangement from land-ownership. The problem the Zionists have to solve in the first instance is therefore how to form a Jewish peasant population, for they hold that all the attempts at colonization made in Palestine are vitiated at the root by the fact that the old system of land-ownership and landlordism has been preserved. The Jews have become possessors of certain lands, but the real tillers of the soil are the Arabs, as is the case with the Germans in certain Slavic portions of Austria.[5] The Poale Zion are thus followers of Franz Oppenheimer, in whose theories regarding Siedlungsgenossenschaften (co-operative settlements)[6] they see a possible realization of their purpose, and they were among the first to suggest that such a settlement should be

undertaken by the Zionist body.[7] That their influence in the Zionist Congress must be considerable, can be seen from the fact that at the Ninth Congress their theories were officially accepted as worthy of a trial.[8] A special fund has been gathered with which this trial is to be made, on land belonging to the National Fund.[9] Many of the demands made in the program of the Democratic Fraction have likewise been accepted by official Zionism.

The formation of the Poale Zion and their recognition by the Congress as a special federation was a novelty in the way of organization. The Zionist body had been built up on the basis of groupings according to territorial aggregations. The differences of opinion between the so-called " politicals " and " practicals " had not gone the length of segregating either the one or the other into separate formations, nor had special economic needs and economic theories entered as contributing factors. With the Poale Zion the case was different. The woof was here cut into by the web, for the Poale Zion were not confined to any territory. They were to be found in all large Jewish centers, and the special needs of a special class found expression in the Zionist position they occupied. But, as

originally conceived, the Zionist organization had made no provision for such groupings. In this respect the Congress has had to grow through an evolution which none of the great Parliaments of the world has been spared. Great Britain is a conspicuous example. Up to the year 1886, the two great parties, Conservatives and Liberals, faced each other alternately on one side of the mace and the other. However much economic questions might divide the country, the lines of economic cleavage ran parallel with those of political separation. The Liberals, as a body, were free-traders; the Conservatives, protectionists. But with the advent of the Irish Party and of the Laborites, this dual hegemony lost its real being, and has been giving way gradually to the Continental system, in which the economic interests of the various parties condition the political complexion of Parliament.

The system has its drawbacks, but its coming was inevitable. In the case of the Zionist Congress, its inadequacy is only too evident, and the danger only too actual. Were such a Congress being held in a Jewish land, the various divisions would rest upon a basis of fact; they would coincide with actual everyday interests. With the Zionists, at the beginning of their work in Palestine, they

rested upon theory, i. e., upon ideal interests. There was therefore little to prevent other theories from finding expression in other groupings, and the whole Congress from developing—or degenerating—into a meeting for theoretical debates, with a natural repercussion in the organization itself. If we bear this in mind, we shall understand the many debates on " organization " that have taken place, from the Second Congress onward. The formation of such groups was strongly opposed by Doctor Herzl and the " politicals," but it was impossible to stave them off, and at the Tenth Congress the wording of the statutes was so changed as to admit them into full fellowship.

Another attempt to cross the Zionist movement by other theories of an economic character was made by the Bund, a name given to the General Jewish Workingmen's Union of Russia and Poland. The formation and the development of this group is of more than passing interest, because it illustrates forcibly the inevitable trend of any concerted Jewish action. Just as the Poale Zion found that the question they were called upon to solve required special treatment because of the fact that it dealt with Jews, so the Bund was compelled to go a certain distance on the road to Jewish nationalism.

At first, the Jewish intellectuals in Russia wished to work hand in hand with the other leaders that had put themselves at the head of the proletarian movement. But they soon saw that, as they would have to labor exclusively in the Pale and with a compact body that had other traditions and other aspirations than their Russian fellow-workmen, other means and methods were necessary. The Bund was formed in 1897. Shortly after this, the Russian Workingmen's Democratic Party was founded. Now, the leaders of the Bund had little sympathy with the religious or national ideals of the Jewish people. Religion they considered to be merely one of the means by which workingmen were held in subjection to the bourgeois class, and their national ideal was more Russian than Jewish. It was therefore quick to throw in its lot with the newly-formed Democratic Party, and it endeavored to find salvation in obliterating any lines of demarcation that might separate it from the general movement.

The Bund, however, had not reckoned fully with the host whose hospitality it proposed to enjoy. The Democratic Party demanded complete assimilation. For this the Bundists were not yet ready. Perhaps a spark of the old fire was still

alive among them. Perhaps also the particularism of their fellow-proletarians of other nationalities shamed them out of complete acquiescence in such demands. For all the other oppressed nationalities had a claim upon the recognition of their national character as part of their platforms. The Jewish workmen were wooed first by one of the national groupings and then by another, in much the same fashion as the Jewish vote has been caressed in Austria and Hungary. The bride declared for none of them, but proceeded to set up house for herself in single blessedness. At its fourth convention, the Bund declared that "a state like Russia, which is composed of a number of different nationalities, should in future be organized on federative principles, each nation enjoying complete autonomy, irrespective of the territory occupied by it," and "that the idea of nationality is also applicable to the Jewish people." [10]

After such a declaration, one would imagine the course of the Jewish Bundists to be clear. But they remained a peculiar section of a peculiar people. The Social-Democratic Party had taken umbrage at the Jews' assuming a position it was willing to accord to other nationalities, and in 1903 it broke completely with the Bund. These

differences and dissensions lasted for three years, during which time the Bund coquetted with Zionism. The logical outcome from its demands was a complete recognition by itself of its Jewish nationalist character, but it evidently did not have the courage to take the step. Its highest ideal remained a sort of cultural nationalism, which was bound up with the use of Judeo-German (Yiddish), elevated for the nonce to the plane of a national speech. It reproached Zionism for refusing to take up the war against capitalism and for striving after an Utopia. On the other hand, it must also be said that the Zionist organization had little real feeling for the Bund. It had studiously avoided taking part in any politics, local or national, in the states in which its adherents lived. In course of time and under the stress of circumstances, the Bund had changed its economic program, and become a revolutionary society. Any connection with it would have proven fatal to Zionist work in Russia, and would have been fraught with infinite harm to the Jews in general. And it was evident that the Bund wished to make use of Zionism to its own ends. In 1906, the opportunity was offered it to round off its national character, when the Poles succeeded in securing recognition from the Workingmen's Dem-

ocratic Party as a national body irrespective of territorial limitations. But the Bund laid down its arms and accepted the ignominious rôle of capitulating to the Democratic Party, thus giving itself its own death-blow.

I have referred above to the fear that the formation of the Poale Zion would inspire and suggest imitation. That this fear was not unwarranted was proved by the constitution of the Mizrachi group. At the Fifth Congress the radical-minded young Zionists had banded together into the so-called Democratic Fraction. Though religious questions in no manner entered into the program of the Fraction, it was quite evident that its members were not attached to the Orthodox view of Jewish theory or practice, and, as they were very determined in their own views, and evidently purposed to effect an influence not only on the decisions of the Congress, but also upon the character of the whole Zionist organization, the orthodox Zionists took alarm and commenced to gather themselves into a separate body. This alarm was heightened by the proceedings of the all-Russian Zionist Conference at Minsk, in 1902, where the discussion on the "Kultur" question seemed to show that this Kultur might become a dangerous weapon in the

hands of the radicals. For the Mizrachi the Zionist ideal is bound up with a strict adherence to the ideas and forms of traditional Judaism. It is true that at the Second Congress [11] and as a result of the Kultur debate, a resolution was adopted emphasizing the point that it is the duty of the Zionist organization to do nothing to offend the scruples of the Orthodox, or "Gesetzestreuen," as they prefer to be called, and this resolution was reiterated at subsequent meetings. For the Mizrachists this was not sufficient. They did not wish the ideas represented by the Fraction and other radical elements to permeate the everyday life of the Zionist societies. They desired also to emphasize the point to those of their own particular persuasion that Zionism was in no way opposed to Orthodoxy, but was in reality part and parcel of its religious outlook. This group was founded in Vilna, and it held its first yearly meeting at Lida, Russia, February 23, 1903, under the leadership of its spiritual father, Rabbi J. Reines of that place. At that time it claimed to have as many as eleven thousand members, and since then it has spread its influence into the most disparate portions of the Diaspora. It maintains, at Jaffa and Jerusalem, model schools on modern lines but upon a Mizrachi

basis. Its representatives at the Congress have been well organized, and, as it officially takes no sides on political and practical questions, it makes its voice heard only when it believes that the principles for which it stands specifically are in danger.

The Mizrachi have, in this way, run a strong religious thread through the fabric of Zionism, and it has not at all times been easy to meet their exigencies in the solution of other than purely religious questions, for Jewish religious premises are too closely interwoven with Jewish life. This difficulty became acute at the Tenth Congress, and it was apparent how dangerous it was to allow such cross-currents to disturb the tide of a stream which in itself did not run all too smoothly. The question of a grant in aid to the Jaffa Hebrew Gymnasium, which was supposed to set its teaching in a direction away from, rather than towards, traditional beliefs, not only called for the opposition of the Mizrachi, but threatened to drive them from the Congress and out of the organization. The efforts at a compromise were only half successful, for the Mizrachi body as a whole refused to give its vote of confidence to the work of its delegates, and the Mizrachi convention which dealt with the matter a little while after the close of the

Congress failed to heal the breach within its own ranks.[12]

The position of the Mizrachi, in its attitude towards the Congress, is a difficult one, but that of the Congress towards the Mizrachi is no less embarrassing. In the practical question at issue during the Tenth Congress, the position taken by the Mizrachi, that no official recognition should be given to the Jaffa Gymnasium, but that, if such recognition was accorded, a similar recognition was due to the Tachkemoni (Mizrachi) schools as well, was fully justified. If the Congress represents all the various tendencies in Zionism, all have the right to demand equality of treatment. But the whole discussion and the warmth of spirit engendered by it show how dangerous is this intermixture of religious considerations with official Zionist work. Anything like a "Kulturkampf" would be most unfortunate, perhaps even fatal. With wise and felicitous foresight, Herzl had seen that Zionism can fulfil its undertaking only if it dismisses all such questions from its concern, and his immediate followers have always held that it was the duty of the organization to stand clear of such entanglements and simply prepare the ground which shall

make possible various manifestations of the Jewish spirit in Palestine.

One further phase demands more than a passing notice, for it has acquired much credit, not only in Zionist quarters, but in Jewry in general. It has not gone the length of forming a party; its fundamental idea precluded such a practical outcome. But its subtle influence has been such that its adepts have raised it to a certain prominence by giving it an appellation, Ahad ha-Amism.

[Notes, pp. 227-228]

CHAPTER VIII

AHAD HA-AM AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF JEWISH HISTORY

It was in the very midst of the upward movement of anti-Semitism in Germany that an attack was made upon Jewish historians in general through a criticism of the most complete account that has as yet been written of Jewish history—the monumental work of Heinrich Graetz. This attack was commenced by Heinrich von Treitschke,[1] the historian of modern Germany and a noted publicist. It was continued by Theodor Mommsen,[2] the historian of ancient Rome, himself a well-wisher of the Jews and their defender. The burden of the complaint seemed to be that the point of view adopted was short-sighted and circumscribed, and that events and movements in Jewish history were regarded in their relation to Jewish interests rather than in connection with the history of the countries in which the Jews lived or from the lofty pinnacle of universal history. It is not my purpose to

discuss the pertinency of the charge or to plead that von Treitschke, in his various articles on the Jewish question, adopts an uncompromising German attitude, and Mommsen champions the Roman cause against the Palestinian Jews in the fifth volume of his history. But, apart from this, in defense of the Jewish historians it may be said that they were too much concerned in gathering the stones wherewith to build up the edifice, to think largely of the relation of the edifice to the buildings erected by others. This is true of Jost, Graetz, Paulus (Selig) Cassel, Steinschneider, Herzfeld, Güdemann, and even of Zunz, the founder of Jewish literary and historical criticism. One has only to think of the mass of conflicting testimony, the inaccessibility of many of the sources out of which Jewish history has to be written, and the preconceived notions accumulated during the centuries of ignorance, both wilful and undesigned, to appreciate the immense amount of work to be done before a comprehensive presentation could be accomplished.

Nor must it be forgotten that the earlier Jewish historians lay under the ban of a more pressing and direct difficulty. They studied and wrote at a moment when the Jewish Middle Ages were on the

point of developing into the Modern Epoch, when for the first time since the Spanish-Arabic period the Jews had come into contact with a new world of thought and with new aspirations. The real difficulty lay in the very fact that the Jewish historians not only wrote but also worked. Most of them stood in the very thick of the fight, and did much of their literary labor with a view to proving and strengthening the religious position with which they were affiliated. Zunz's *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* was written in favor of the plea that a sermon in the vernacular should be introduced into the service of the Synagogue.[3] The last volume of Graetz's history was nothing more than a long polemic, historical in character, against the Reform movement; while Steinschneider's voluminous and minute investigations were intended to prove that the Jews had not been insensible to outside cultural influences with which they had been brought in contact. From a certain point of view, then, all these writings are vitiated by the fact that they are, in a measure, Tendenzschriften; but this does not detract from their value in other respects.

The ground thus prepared, it became possible for Jewish scholars to survey the history of their people from a more general point of view. During the

last twenty years, three attempts have been made to write a philosophy of Jewish history. The first is that of James Darmesteter,[4] written with all the elegance and charm with which that scholar was wont to inform whatsoever his pen touched. But Darmesteter, although in his youth a student of Jewish theology, had become too far removed from Jewish life and from contact with his Jewish brethren to understand fully the forces at work among them. Jewish history was to him a dead body, into which he put the knife of the calm and cool investigator. He characterizes his own position when he says:[5] "Not yet have all those engaged in these studies [i. e., history of religion, etc.] reached that degree of serene impartiality where facts are studied for the sole purpose of being understood, and where thought is carried to a height that will not permit of conclusions dictated in advance by the ephemeral prejudices of politics, of faith, or of metaphysics." He had a surer knowledge of Zoroastrianism than of Judaism. He probably looked upon the Jews as he did upon the Parsees—a remnant that has survived from times gone by, interesting to the historian, especially to one who had issued from them, and who was concerned that a decent tombstone should be set

upon their grave. For in his concluding paragraph we read:[e]

> Does this mean that Judaism should nurse dreams of ambition, and think of realizing one day that "invisible church of the future," invoked by some in prayer? This would be an illusion, whether on the part of a narrow sectarian or on that of an enlightened individual. . . . And when the nation who made the Bible shall have disappeared—the race and the cult—though leaving no visible trace of its passage upon earth, its imprint will remain in the depth of the heart of generations, who will, unconsciously perhaps, live upon what has been implanted in their breasts.

Evidently Darmesteter did not realize that in Eastern Europe there were millions of these his Jewish brethren who were not ready for suicide or interment, but had visions of Jewish life very different from those entertained by the elegant litterateur and versatile scholar in the French capital. In Darmesteter's presentation the personal note is wanting entirely. He is concerned chiefly in showing that the Jews have not been vagabonds on the face of the earth, nor have they been held in the rigid vise of their own constricted circle; that they have been present at all the great junctures in the world's history, and have done as fair a share of the work as could in reason be expected of them; and, finally, through the prophetic portions of their

Bible they have sent a force into the world that will last to the end of time. Darmesteter is concerned with an honorable past; he has no thought for the present, and no hope, at least no particularly Jewish hope, for the future. He is a Frenchman of the Jewish race.

A somewhat different note is struck by Simon Dubnow.[7] The painstaking historian of the Jews in Poland and Russia was better situated than his French predecessor to know the people of whom he wrote. He had devoted a singularly fertile pen to elucidating the political and communal life of his brethren living in the great East End of Europe. He was in daily intercourse with many of their leaders, and was therefore in a much better position to know their mind and express their hopes. The more the wonder that one finds no mention by him of the newer hope that had for fully thirty years—his essay was first published in 1893—been transforming his Jewish countrymen. It is true that he speaks of a "Jewish national soul"; but this is merely the deposit of "a mass of similar impressions which have cystallized." And as Jewish history is both national and universal, it is to the universal side that we ought to bend our efforts. "Union with mankind at large, on the basis of the

spiritual and intellectual, the goal set up by the Jewish prophets in their sublime vision of the future, is the ultimate ideal of Judaism's noblest votaries." Religion, race, and especially the community of historical fortunes, are the elements that have held the Jews together in the past. Presumably these factors are to have the same effect in the future, though Dubnow does not dilate on this. The true significance of Jewish history, he finds, lies in the rôle it has played of conciliator: it has accomplished its end as far as the Biblical part is concerned, and he believes that the time is not very far when " the second half of Jewish history, the record of two thousand years of the Jewish people's life after the Biblical period, will be accorded the same treatment." A better knowledge of this history will secure respect for the Jewish people, because it will be a source of sublime moral truths. He ends with these words, " In this sense, Jewish history in its entirety is the pledge of the spiritual union between the Jews and the rest of the nations."

As an historian, Dubnow characterizes the interplay of Jewish movements and uncovers the underlying spiritual " motives " with a master hand. But one who is historian and philosopher is not, of neces-

sity, also a prophet. Dubnow seems to be a prophet of soft illusions in a time of stern realities. There is a sort of nebulous uncertainty about the prophecy which reminds one of the many beauteous peans on the Messianic time that grace the columns of the Western Jewish press. His message to his suffering Jewish brethren is to continue to suffer nobly and continue to demonstrate that they are worthy of their heroic past. In such advice there is neither light nor leading.

Ahad ha-Am has delved far deeper into the Jewish conscience than either of the two preceding. I do not know that he has ever written anything that bears so ambitious a title as a Philosophy of Jewish History. Darmesteter and Dubnow are, *ex professio,* historians. Ahad ha-Am is a student of philosophy, and his historical ken has a philosophic depth entirely wanting in his predecessors. In addition, he is in perfect sympathy with the people, for whose ills he is seeking a solution, and the cause of whose ills he proposes to study. In his own soul he has felt all that his people has suffered; and yet he has sufficient detachment to study its ills with a severity that does honor to his acumen, as his feeling does to his character. His main theory as

SIX STAMPS OF THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND

The cancelled stamp is a post-stamp used in the Jewish colonies in Palestine

to the cause of Jewish unrest is laid down in the opening paragraph of *The Way of Life:*

> The vicissitudes of Israel throughout the Dispersion, but particularly during these latter days of ours, make it plain that we Jews cannot hope to lead the life of a separate nation among strange peoples, and yet be as one of them, taking part in all the activities about us as though we were full-blooded natives of the lands of our sojourn, and at the same time remain a nation peculiar in views and distinct in character. . . . Misfortunes maim our manhood, favorable circumstances our national spirit. The former make of us men despicable in the eyes of our fellows, the latter a nation despicable in its own sight. . . . Two paths lie stretched out before us: the path of life and the path of death. If our eyes are fixed upon the death goal, then let us disregard the counsel of temporizing healers, let us await death with a calm spirit. . . . If, however, we choose life, then it behooves us to build us a house for ourselves alone, and in a secure spot—and can there be any spot securer than the land inherited from our fathers?—then it behooves us to consecrate our noblest powers, material and spiritual, to the one purpose, the regeneration of our people in the land of our forefathers.

The national feeling, Ahad ha-Am holds, has never really been dead among the Jews. It has been overwhelmed and driven into a corner by the feeling of self-love which has dominated so large a section of the people. He finds that this self-love is prevalent even among those who have held aloft the standard of Nationalism and of Zion; that the

moral concept which the word " national " typifies to him, has given way to a materialistic connotation. In fact, his continued cry has been that the Western Jews have paid for their emancipation with moral slavery, and that what he calls " the fundamental morality of the Jewish spirit " affords the true historical basis for the ideal of the national revival. In other words, the term " national " is to him no empty-sounding word, but it is expressive of the very essence of the Hebraic spirit, and the Hebraic spirit is the spirit of Prophetism. In turn, the spirit of Prophetism is the spirit of righteousness, righteousness not only in word but also in actions. If the Jews are really to follow the ideal traced out for them by the greatest of their teachers, and become a peculiar people in the sense of " exemplars of righteousness," they must be enabled to live unfettered and to " develop along their own lines, as one of the social units of humanity."

Ahad ha-Am is insistent upon this, the real meaning, as he considers it, of the Jewish national sentiment. His interest is centered upon something other than the political form of any resettlement of Jews in Palestine. He is not even interested that such a settlement should be large in extent. His real concern is for the form of Jewish culture that will

be fructified there. In Palestine it would be possible to revive the real spirit of Judaism, if—and only if—those who settle there are fully imbued with the true sense of this spirit. Palestine is to be "a spiritual center." But in order that it may become this, the Jews in the Diaspora who are working towards this end must also be regenerated spiritually, so that "the spiritual center which is destined to be created in our ancestral country" shall come as a "response to a real and insistent national demand."

The attempt has been made in various quarters to set up the postulate of a "spiritual center" as a negation of what is called Herzlian Zionism, or at least as a substitute for it. It is true that Ahad ha-Am has been engaged at various times in ardent polemics with Zionists, even with official Zionism.[8] But the differences have often seemed to be rather the concomitant of violent discussion regarding one or the other phase of Zionist effort than opposition to the movement as a whole. In the same way, though he was one of the leaders in the earlier Hibbat Zion enthusiasm, he violently deprecated the manner in which colonization in Palestine was then attempted, a journey to Palestine in the early "nineties" of the last century having con-

vinced him of the false basis on which it was being carried out.[9] Ahad ha-Am was a member of the First Zionist Congress, in 1907. He has criticised the Basel Program as one-sided and as purely political and economic in character. He holds that this political character narrows down the Zionist conception and robs it of half of its true meaning. But at the same time, he acknowledges it as a part of his own program. "On one side," he says, "we must work for the creation of an extensive and well-ordered settlement in our ancestral land; but, on the other side, we are not at liberty to neglect the effort to create there, at the same time, a fixed and independent center for our national culture, for learning, art, and literature."[10] In fact, he seems to demand the formation of "a special organization for cultural work," which shall march hand in hand with the political Zionist body.[11]

Ahad ha-Am is the great preacher of prophetical Hebraism. According to his own analysis, one of the characteristics of the prophets was their extremism. It is evident that he imitates them at least in this particular. It must be conceded that a number of the Zionist leaders, especially during the early days of the movement, had little sense for the higher aspect of the whole question. In excuse of them it

may be said that many had issued from surroundings that were out of touch with the spiritual and religious life of Judaism, and the economic and political side of their work engaged so much of their attention as to cover the whole field of their vision. But the moment Herzl came into real contact with the Jewish people, he issued the parole: "Zionism means a return to Judaism prior to a return to a Jewish land,"[12] even though he might not have understood the word Judaism in the same manner as Ahad ha-Am or others. The various discussions at the Congresses on the question of Kultur, far removed though they were at times from the kernel of the subject, showed that the idea was germinating in the minds of many of the delegates. In fact, at the very first Congress, Doctor Ehrenpreis proposed the formation of a special organization for the study and the spread of the Hebrew language,[13] one of the measures which Ahad ha-Am specifies as leading towards the rebirth of the Hebraic spirit.

Indeed, it is a true sign that the spirit for which Ahad ha-Am pleads is still alive among the Jewish people that those who have gone to Palestine have, entirely of their own accord and without any suggestion from the outside, proceeded directly to the

cultivation of the Hebrew spirit along lines that lead to the goal envisaged by Ahad ha-Am. That spirit has been refreshed and refined by the surroundings in which it moves; more normal conditions of life have had the natural effect, and a noble ideal has not been soiled for want of free room in which to develop. There the Hebrew language is indeed being cultivated, and is gradually driving Judeo-German and the European tongues to the wall. It is being employed in schools and in daily intercourse. Art has commenced to find a home there, due to the efforts of Boris Schatz and the Bezalel School. The Hebrew Gymnasium at Jaffa may be criticised in certain directions; these faults are part of the residue brought from the Galut and will be removed by filtration. For the Gymnasium and the Tachkemoni schools serve one and the same end—to train the young in the spirit of the fathers, in the rejuvenated ideals of the past. Jewish life cannot be unilateral in its development. The Jews coming to Palestine will have passed through the sieve of various civilizations, will have acquired varied experiences, which have become a part of their being. Above all, the authentic voice of the Synagogue has spoken in various tones to its different members and in

diverse notes. They will come with divergent views of life, which they cannot be asked to relinquish when living together. Indeed, Zionism would fail of its truest purpose—to insure surroundings of such a nature as to permit the free development of minds that are themselves free—if it neglected to take account of these divergences.

It is good to have one that cries out—let us hope, not in the wilderness—how inconsiderately soever the crying may be done. The expression "spiritual revival" is not a mere catchword. It contains a heartening appeal, which is to prick the torpid idealism of the Jewish public and bring back to it the full intent and meaning of Jewish nationalism. But if the "local center" is to be established—and for this Ahad ha-Am pleads—it can only be done by much spade-work. The building must be erected from the ground up, and not from the top down. It must not be forgotten that, beginning with 1897, everything of a material kind had to be created—Congress, bank, National Fund, all the various instruments, paraphernalia, and trappings which are the outer shell of a national revival. The prophets of old cried condemnation upon every part of the body politic—king, priests, and people, even on other prophets. But the diffi-

cult task of representing law and order, of keeping the ship of state above the waters, rested with the men in command at Jerusalem. The prophets saw above and beyond the heads of those whom they criticised; they often failed to see the ground upon which they trod. Isaiah could say that neither Assyria nor Egypt was more than a broken reed upon which to rest; but one was threatening from the north, the other was menacing from the south. A "splendid isolation" may have been morally right; it was politically unsound.

Ahad ha-Am's plaint, that Zionism leaned too much towards the political side, as Chovevi Zion had leaned too much to the practical, may be justified in theory. But neither the "politicals" nor the "practicals" desired the Zionist movement to issue as did the Bene Mosheh; and to say with Ahad ha-Am, that "Zionism has need not only of subscriptions and shares, but even more of souls,"[14] is to utter a platitude. For these souls were in the process of being won by the very methods that were being condemned. It was only by "subscriptions" to the Jewish Colonial Trust, to the National Fund, and to many other Zionist foundations, that many were able to show their attachment to the cause. Gathered within its ranks

were many of "the poor and the needy," to whom "subscriptions and shares" meant a real sacrifice —a signal evidence of the very spirit for which Ahad ha-Am was contending. In the various clubs, societies, and meetings, the old bonds were being reforged, and the gaze was being converged upon what was still an ideal center, but which, it was hoped, would some day become invested with reality, and which Ahad ha-Am has so trenchantly described as possessing "a strong attraction for all of them, not because of some accidental or temporary relation, but by virtue of its own right," and in which "all will find at once a purifying fire and a connecting link." [15]

[Notes, pp. 228-229]

CHAPTER IX

ZIONISM AND THE WESTERN JEWS

Among the many misconceptions current in regard to Zionism, one of the most popular would confine its function to some particular class of Jews, to some section distinguished either by its economic condition or by its peculiar conception of the Jewish religion, or to those living in a certain part of the great Diaspora. It has been said, and it has been written, that such a concentration of Jews and such a centralization of Jewish efforts as is foreshadowed by the Basel Platform, may be a means for mitigating in part some of the Jewish misery that is only too apparent in Eastern Europe, that it may well prove another outlet for those unfortunate ones who are forced through the Russian and Roumanian mill, that it may relieve the pressure which is so evident in the Ghettos of Galicia, and offer a further means of livelihood to those who are in too active a competition in the great European and American centers. In a word, Zionism, regarded from this

angle, has no real message to the emancipated Jew of Western Europe and America, and its sole significance lies in the fact that it is another attempt to heal the wounds inflicted upon the Jews by modern industrial developments.

On the other hand, the assertion is made that Zionism may have a message for those who have remained within the four walls of Orthodox Judaism, and is the logical outcome of the ideas and hopes that have been conserved wherever traditional Judaism has retained its hold, but for those Jews whose trend of thought and whose course of life have led them away from the beaten track, it may be a matter of indifference what the ultimate fate of Palestine is, and a Jewish center has no part in the conception they have of the future of the Jews and no religious worth in their image of the future of the Jewish faith. This is very frankly the attitude of the Reform wing of the Synagogue in Western Europe and in America. For them Zionism has no message, or, if it has any, it is one of despair and an unworthy acquiescence—and a somewhat unwilling one at that—in circumstances which we have not religious and moral power enough to overcome. The leaders of American Reform have gone even further than

this, and look upon Zionism as the negation of the best hope and promise of Judaism, as a wilful abjuration of the rôle traced for Judaism by the greatest of the prophets. The dissemination and diffusion of the Jews throughout all parts of the world is elevated by them to the position of doctrinal sublimity, and stress is laid upon this dispersion as the means—one might almost say, the only means—for the proper fulfilment of the Jewish "mission."

Now, we may leave out of account any attempt to define the word mission when used of a people. To do so would lead dangerously near to religious speculations and to the discussion of questions which might raise the *odium theologicum*. But the question is pertinent: how is such a mission to be carried out, if in the process the bearers of the mission are bound to succumb? It is true that, until quite modern times, the various communities of Jews maintained their existence in a manner which at first sight seems to defy explanation. Without any visible unity, without any physical or ideal center, at times without much intercommunion, individual bodies of Jews have existed in all corners of the Diaspora. They have succeeded in existing because of the ideal bond

that held them together, a common past and a common hope for the future. This bond has remained practically unchanged throughout the ages. Judaism has been surprisingly free from sectarian schisms. With the exception of that of the Karaites, none has come to disturb the unity of practice and aspiration that welded the different communities together into an unseen brotherhood. Living in agglomerations that were usually small in extent, they have been able to keep up a similar communal life by means of a common practice. Territorial distinctions have been disregarded and almost obliterated. In the early Middle Ages there was little difference between the life of the Palestinian and the Babylonian Jew, as little as there was between the Continental and the English. Even the distinction between Sefardic and Ashkenazic Jew was not accentuated until both commenced to live outside the countries from which they derived their nomenclature. An Asher ben Yehiel could become an authority in Spain, a Solomon ben Adret an oracle in Germany. To the great world-movements with which they came in contact they were not insensible. They had a fair share in their development, and were themselves not uninfluenced by the contact. But only in rare

instances was this influence allowed to drive deep down into their beings. If Philo was more of a neo-Platonist than he was a Jew, his example was not followed; neither was Spinoza's. From Saadia to Maimonides, it was the non-Jewish systems of philosophy that were put into the strait-jacket of Jewish theology. In most cases the Jews retired from this contact before the harm had become too great. Hellenism is the classic example of the reverse policy, a policy in consequence of which large numbers must have become lost to the Jewish cause.

At the present day, however, the circumstances in which the Jews live are very different. The constitution of European society during the Middle Ages was such as to favor individual groupings. Communities were disjointed from one another; means of intercommunication were undeveloped; news could not spread easily and rapidly; cities were comparatively small, and even in those in which contact with the larger world would have affected adversely Jewish cohesiveness, compensating influences were present in the Ghetto system and in the steady, though scanty, infiltration from country communities. The industrial development of modern times has thoroughly changed conditions. The

rise of national feeling has frowned upon other combinations within the state, so that a general leveling process has been at work. Cities have grown to immeasurable proportions. The race to these large centers has been fast and furious. Thus, not only have the Ghetto walls been cast down; the smaller communities outside of the large cities have been greatly depeopled of their Jewish inhabitants. France is a classic example. We think of the flourishing communities in the Midi, in Avignon, Carpentras, Carcassone, etc., where now many of the synagogues are closed, and Jewish centers are on the verge of disappearance, because most of the Jews have gone to Paris, there to be swallowed up in the great army of the unchurched. Italy is another instance. Bari, Otranto, Reggio, Ancona, Pesaro, and many other places that would constitute an "Italia Judaica," have become denuded of Jews, in favor of Rome and Florence. Similar conditions in other countries could easily be cited.

In addition, the language and customs of their surroundings have pressed heavily upon the Jews. In the Middle Ages, documents concerning transactions between Jews and non-Jews were usually drawn up in two languages, of which one was Hebrew. Such documents have come down to us from

Spain, from Germany, and from England. There was nothing strange in this; for even among non-Jews a literary tongue, the Latin, was still the language in which official documents of all sorts were drawn up. In modern times, modern languages have displaced the old literary tongue. Latin has been relegated to the store-room of the university, and Hebrew to the study-room of the learned. Custom, social practice, and social life have been unfavorable to the retention of peculiar Jewish observances, which have been largely banished from collective gatherings and from the household. They have been relegated to the synagogue and confined there. But even the synagogue has had to give way to the unifying forces at work to-day. We may think that, in many instances, this has gone too far, and an unwarranted desire for assimilation has found a pretext in what is called "the needs of the day." But even where this has not been the case, many concessions have had to be made. There is no doubt that such concessions are bound to increase in the future, and in this manner Jewish communities will tend to develop away from each other. The German Jew is not so apt to feel at home in Anglo-Jewish surroundings or in the synagogues of English-speaking countries

as he was wont to formerly, nor the Italian Jew in Germany. "Deutsche Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens" have commenced to lose touch with their French brethren, and in some circles in the United States we have heard mutterings about an "American Judaism." The points of contact are evidently growing less in number and weaker in strength, and as Jewish unity tends to disappear, a consequent deadening of Jewish consciousness is bound to occur. There is, indeed, evidence that the process has already begun. It is true that at all times such a danger has been more or less present. Many have been lost to the Jewish cause. This enables us to understand the relatively small number of Jews existing at the present day, in spite of the acknowledged fecundity of the race. But the ravages occasioned by modern conditions—active anti-Semitism on the one hand, passive social oppression on the other—are nothing less than alarming. As regards Western Europe and America, this loss has been offset of late years by immigration from Eastern Europe. But such immigration cannot continue indefinitely, and the continued depression of the masses in Eastern Europe is having its effect in making the material with which the reconstructive process in the West is being carried on less

worthy of its purpose and less effective in carrying it out.

I have left out of all account the ignoble suggestion, made among others by Schopenhauer,[1] Eduard von Hartmann,[2] Mommsen,[3] and the Roumanian historian Xenopol,[4] that it would be a serviceable act to the nations with which they live, if the Jews would subscribe to the Christian creed, even if they do not believe in it. It is sad to see so eminent and so truly liberal a scholar as Professor Theodor Nöldeke in Strassburg[5] subscribe to a similar view: that Jewish parents ought to bring up their children in the Christian faith, in order that these children may be able to become full Germans, and be released from the suffering the parents have undergone, an idea ventilated also by a Jew who signs himself "Benedictus Levita" (both of which names he besmudges in using them) in the Preussische Jahrbücher.[6] The whole idea must be repugnant to every right-minded Christian, as it must be to any but a bloodless Jew.

From the foregoing observations it will be clear that some means are necessary to counteract the corroding influences to which reference has been made. From whatever point of view we regard the situation, the unity of Israel must be restored.

A complete reversion to the unity of practice seems impossible, as modern conditions in the Diaspora will continue to increase disfavorably to the Jews. The Jewish hope must be reconstituted upon modern lines. Embodied in a physical center, and that center illumined by a rekindled light, it will serve as a point towards which the thoughts, aspirations, and longings of the Diaspora Jews will converge, and from which they will draw, each in his own measure, that sufficiency of moral and religious strength that will better enable them to resist the encroachments of their surroundings. The knowledge that in some one place, in some one country —and that country the most hallowed by its recollections—Jewish life is possible without the unnatural restrictions that naturally hem it in elsewhere, will act as a centripetal force, the very force that is so much needed to-day.

It may be objected that this will constitute a religious life by delegation to others. But the erection of a Jewish center in Palestine would in no way carry with it the nullification of duties resting upon Jews elsewhere. The Reform Jew, with his ideal of a mission, could carry forward that mission in the future as he has in the past. The theory that Zionism looks for the concentration of all

Jews on one spot is a theory of windy unreality, which has loomed large in the minds of those only who do not understand, or who persist in misrepresenting, its basal teaching. For Palestine, even in the broadest definition ever thought of by prophet or singer, is insufficient to contain a large portion of the Jewish population of the world in addition to its present inhabitants. In very fact, a serious stimulus would be given to the spreading of the very mission it is feared will be endangered. The closer Jews are kept within the fold, the greater their interest in Jewish life and Jewish thought, the more propagators there will be for that mission. The early Reformers at least were insistent upon the view that whatever divergence from received practice they favored was not due to a simple love for divergence itself, but was the result of the difficulties experienced in overcoming a situation that demanded a greater sacrifice than their congregants felt able to make. Their spiritual descendants might well welcome any movement calculated to render the Jew more willing to sacrifice than he is to-day.

Another serious difficulty that seems to confront the Western Jew is the supposed conflict that might arise between his responsibility to a Jewish

concentration and his allegiance and fealty towards the state of which he is a citizen. The struggle for political emancipation in European countries during the nineteenth century has left its mark behind in a certain nervousness on the part of the Jew concerning the fruits of the victory gained. This is due to the fact that only in one country, France, had the right been conceded freely. In other states, it had been won after a period of political strife that had not been wanting in acerbity. The Jews felt that their claim to citizenship was still questioned by a not inconsiderable portion of their fellow-citizens. They themselves seemed to consider it, not a right inherent in their status, but the result of a barter in which they had to pay an exorbitant price. That exorbitant price was an exaggerated nationalist ardor for the country of their adoption. This feeling was fed still further by the charge of the anti-Semites, that the Jews formed an *imperium in imperio*. The latter charge might well be neglected, for it was advanced long before the rise of modern Zionism; and anti-Semites, whose warmth is apt to be fed by the heat of passion, are not known to be overscrupulous in testing the veracity of their facts or the cogency of their arguments. M. Théodore Reinach, re-

garding the Jewish question in France from another point of view, makes the price to be paid a moral life unapproachable by large masses of men—" all our men of commerce must be honest, all our millionaires simple and charitable, all our learned men modest, all our journalists patriotic and disinterested," [7] a degree of perfection not demanded of any other element in the French state. But quite apart from such considerations, there are many Jews who are most sincere in their fear that Zionism and patriotic citizenship are somewhat incompatible with each other. This is practically the burden of the official protest published by the council of the German Rabbiner-Verband two months previous to the first Basel Congress, in 1897. It was repeated by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1898,[8] and it has continually reappeared as a ghost that frightens and refuses to be laid.

Now, I have already hinted that this fear is based upon an abnormal valuation of the contents of citizenship. It is founded on the errors that citizenship is coincident with racial unity, and that a good citizen can have no other ties of allegiance than those which bind him to the state of which he is a member. That this is not the case can be seen by the most casual observer. Germany

and Austria-Hungary are examples to hand of the falsity of the whole theory. In the one, we find Danes, Poles, Czechs, Wends, and Walloons, besides a number of smaller races, all owning fealty to the German Empire. In Austria-Hungary we have Germans, Poles, Magyars, Czechs, and Croats doing homage to the same emperor-king. No less a German than the Emperor William II has said: "The kingdom of Prussia is made up of many races that are proud of their past history and of their individuality [Eigenart]. This does not prevent them from being, above all [vor Allem] excellent Prussians." Our own country has a population made up of the most diversified racial elements. Here the Germans have done excellently in preserving their own peculiar customs and national traditions. They have their German Sängerbund, their German societies; they cultivate their national literature, and sustain German newspapers and German societies. No charge has ever been brought against them that, for this reason, they are less American than their co-citizens of other races. The Irish-Americans have done the same, and much more. They have intervened actively in the social and political affairs of their mother-land. No more fervent or devoted nation-

alists exist to-day than the Americans of Irish extraction. In Canada, the French have gone even further. They have to all real purpose remained French, though they have become excellent British subjects, just as the Boers persist the Dutchmen they were before the year 1903, though loyally accepting British citizenship.

The point need not be labored further, nor the examples multiplied. They serve as the best refutation of the view held by many Jews of the supposed conflict between Zionism and citizenship, and show that this view is ill-imagined. The state cannot demand that the individual shall relinquish his peculiarities, his traditions, his family relationship. Nor can it ask of any group to give up its historic associations, its connection with other groups of the same race or of the same religion living elsewhere. It can only demand that as citizens all elements shall put the needs of the state in which they live in the forefront of their thought and render to it and to the ideals for which it stands the best effort they are capable of. Should a conflict ever arise between the duties towards the state in which the Jew lives and his responsibility to the reconstructed Jewish home, he will be forced to make his choice—in exactly the same manner as the Ger-

man-American or the Irish-American would be compelled to do in similar circumstances. But as the Jewish home is not to be founded for territorial or other aggrandizement, such a conflict lies in the penumbra of pure speculation.

In preparation for this home, Zionism has commenced to lay the foundation stones. Its work in Palestine is a surety that the end can be reached, if only the will is there. But it has been less successful in organizing the Jewish communities in the Old and New World for this or, in fact, for any combined purpose.[9] And yet the conviction forces itself upon us that some such organization of Jewry is necessary. I should have used the expression "international Jewry," had not that expression been seized upon in some quarters to denote a certain opposition on the part of the Jews to the aspirations of the various states in which they live. If the Jewish interests at stake are purely religious, as is often claimed, it stands to reason that some common direction must be given to these interests. Even as a religious body, we cannot measure our numbers with those of other faiths, and the losses we sustain by secession or because of indifference are hardly more than made good by a birthrate that is also steadily decreasing.

At one time the idea was cherished that the Alliance Israélite Universelle would serve as a unifying force, but the parallel societies founded in other countries rendered nugatory the hopes that had been set upon the larger program of the Alliance. The new societies are doomed to follow in the wake of the parent body. The very nature of their formation, the help they are bound to demand from the Governments under which they are organized, and upon whom they reckon for the furthering of their end, vitiate them at their source, as far as their general Jewish service is concerned.

Nor have more ambitious attempts been more successful. The Russian excesses in the "eighties" and "nineties" of the last century might have led, and ought to have led, to a permanent pooling of Jewish interests. Unfortunately they did not, probably because Jewish leaders in philanthropy and charity insisted upon regarding the sinister Russian business as an event rather than as a state, and persisted in the fatuous belief that conditions could be met as they arose. The same infirmity of purpose was evident in the conferences held at Frankfort (1904), London (1905), and Brussels (1906). Some agreements were reached upon minor points, and measures were taken looking to

the regulating of emigration from Russia. But the meetings finished as they had begun, and were fruitless of permanent results. Evidently some other basis must be found upon which the future of the Jews and of Judaism is to be built. Zionism proposes to offer that basis, one that is wide, inclusive, self-confident without boasting, and informed with an outlook courageous and undismayed.

To speculate upon the future of Zionism would be absurd. To predict its success upon the lines of its modern development would be as reckless as to foretell its failure. The transmutation of values, to use a Nietzschean term, that is being accomplished in these latter days makes a sober mind wary of prophecy. The situation of Turkey is more distraught than ever; the political status of Palestine may suffer a change at any moment. However, the continuing dispersion of the Jews into yet new corners of the globe makes the Jewish patriot, whether he be purely religious, or purely national, or religiously national, fearful of the consequences. The incessant pressure of the outside world is having its slow and cumulative effect. They who do not see this are blind wilfully. Some such solution of the problem as that foreshadowed

in the Zionist outlook seems necessary and desirable—if there is to be any outlook left, and if the "remnant that returns" is to be worthy of its issue. It has been said in another connection [10] that a people that has had a great past, if it is to have a correspondingly great future, must also have a great present. For this great present Zionism is working, in order that Judaism may have a still more glorious future. And in this sense Zionism and Judaism become one and the same.

[Notes, pp. 230-231]

NOTES

Chapter I

THE PRE-HERZLITES

(pp. 17-47)

[1] Arakin, 17[2].

[2] See the excellent presentation by Max L. Margolis, The Mendelssohnian Programme, in Jewish Quarterly Review, xvii. 531 et seq.

[3] Jew. Quart. Rev. xviii. 273. It is interesting to note that an early Jewish philosopher was not insensible, however far he had traveled from the beaten track, to the old Jewish hope. In his theological treatise, Spinoza remarks: "Indeed, unless the fundamentals of their [i. e., the Jews'] religion bring upon them effeminacy of mind and character, I am inclined to believe that, with the opportunity afforded, since human affairs are notoriously changeable, they may again recover their empire, and God elect them to himself anew." Tractatus Teol. Pol. iii. 53; in English translation, London, 1868, p. 87.

[4] Protokolle und Aktenstücke der Zweiten Rabbiner-Versammlung, Frankfort, 1845, p. 106. In somewhat similar spirit, but in cryptic language, the founder of the science of national psychology, H. Steinthal—who, singularly enough, failed to understand the psychology of his own people—calls Zion "the innermost kernel of the inner consciousness of modern nations" (quoted in Ahad ha-Am, Selected Essays, Philadelphia, 1912, p. 180), and Adolphe Franck speaks of Jerusalem as "une ville idéale qui n'existe que dans le passé et dans l'avenir, dans le souvenir et dans l'espérance" (Nouvelles Etudes Orientales, Paris, 1896, p. 302). In a tone unworthy of a great philosopher, Hermann Cohen says, "Weil wir Palästina allenfalls als eine Reisegelegenheit betrachten" (Ein Bekenntniss in der Judenfrage, Berlin, 1880, p. 14). See also, Greenstone, The Messiah Idea, pp. 243 et seq.

[5] The most significant is Bulgaria, with "a peasant people who have been for five hundred years barely a name in the world at large or even to themselves." Monthly Review, Jan. 1906, p. 25.

[6] Mommsen, Römische Geschichte, v. 542. The Earl of Cromer (Ancient and Modern Imperialism, p. 93) has a fine paragraph on the relation of Rome to the Jews, which he finishes with the following sentence, "The Jews were vanquished and dispersed, but they never were assimilated."

[7] Vogelstein and Rieger, Gesch. der Juden in Rom, i. 26; Jean Réville, Die Religion zu Rom, p. 10.

[8] It is interesting to note that Zamenhof was originally a nationalist Jew. In 1881 he convened a meeting of his Jewish fellow-students at the Moscow University for the purpose of forming a Jewish colony in some part of the globe, which should become the center of an independent Jewish state. See Jewish Chronicle, Sept. 6, 1907, p. 17.

[9] Orpheus, German transl., p. 192.

[10] On the modernization of the Synagogue service and the danger of its becoming Christianized, see a fair criticism from the standpoint of incipient Zionism in the article by Margolis, already referred to, Jew. Quart. Rev. xvii. 534. Comp. also Louis Zangwill, Church or Synagogue, in Jewish Chronicle, Nov. 29, 1907, p. 8.

[11] See such passages as Amos ix. 14; Zeph. iii. 20; Zach. x. 10; Ps. xiv. 7; Is. ii. 1-4; Deut. xxx. 1-5; and comp. Schultz, Alttestamentliche Theologie, Göttingen, 1889, p. 742.

[12] See Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, liii. 534.

[13] On Jewish conversions to Christianity, see N. Samter, Judentaufen im 19. Jahrhundert, Berlin, 1906. Some data from this book will be found in Die Welt, x. no. 6, pp. 10 et seq. Comp. also Ruppin, The Jews of To-Day, 1913, pp. 181 et seq.

[14] A collection of such sayings will be found in Zisling, Yalkut Erez Yisraël, Vilna, 1890; Baruch David Hakohen, Sefer Hibbat ha-Arez, Jerusalem, 1897.

[15] In 1540 an Augsburg Jew seems to have had Messianic ideas

in connection with the founding of a Jewish state. See the letter of Sebastian Theodoricus Windsheim to Dr. Vogler, in Anzeiger des Germanischen National-Museums, 1894, p. 103.

[16] Revue . . . von Böhmen, Oct. 1903, p. 14.

[17] It is worthy of note that the last edition of Hess' book was burnt by order of his family, in order to remove this "offense." See Die Welt, ii. no. 9, p. 16.

[18] Simon Szanto, editor of the Vienna Neue Zeit. I have the quotation from the Zionistisches A-B-C Buch, Berlin, 1908, p. 66.

[19] The original essay was published in the Jahrbuch für Israeliten, 1863-1864, and has been republished with an introduction by Theodor Zlocisti in Jüdischer Volkskalender, Brünn, 1903-1904, pp. 90 et seq.

[20] See Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, viii. 106 et seq.; xxi. 230 et seq. In France, too, a voice was heard, the owner of which deserves to be rescued from oblivion. Lazar Lévy-Bing of Nancy was a successful banker and later a member of the Chambre des Deputés (1871). He espoused warmly the cause of Jewish nationalism at a time and amid circumstances in which one would least have expected it. It was the heyday of the resuscitated monarchy in France, a time of much French chauvinism, in which the Jews took a considerable part. Lévy-Bing was fired by a pamphlet written by a Christian, Abraham Pétavel. Though a Protestant minister and professor in Neuchâtel and an outspoken conversionist, Pétavel had become a member of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. In 1864 an anonymous pamphlet appeared in Geneva under the title, Devoir des nations de rendre au peuple juif sa nationalité. Though, at a later time, Pétavel denied the authorship, he is responsible for a poem, La fille de Sion, ou la rétablissement d'Israël (Paris, 1864), which expresses views identical with those in the pamphlet. It was the discussion in the Archives Israélites on this pamphlet that brought Lévy-Bing to the front with a warm plea for Jewish nationality and a demand that Jerusalem should be made the ideal center of the world. See Die Welt, 1903, no. 51.

[21] No. 243, "Constantinople, le 23 Germinal. Bonaparte a fait

publier une proclamation, dans laquelle il invite tous les juifs de l'Asie et de l'Afrique à venir se ranger sous ses drapeaux pour rétablir l'ancienne Jérusalem." See Max Kohler in Publ. Amer. Jew. Hist. Soc., x. 172.

[22] See Max J. Herzberg in The Maccabaean, xiii. 4.

[23] See Arnold White in Newberry House Magazine, June, 1893. Disraeli is also said to have supported Laurence Oliphant's scheme for an autonomous state in Palestine. See Jewish Chronicle, Dec. 16, 1904, p. 25.

[24] Remarks upon the Present Condition of the Jews in Palestine, Kerleys, 1852.

[25] See Maurice Léon in The Maccabaean, ii. 256.

[26] See Die Welt, i. no. 22, p. 7.

[27] Extracts from Daniel Deronda, vol. ii, book 1, have been put together in the Publ. of the Fed. of American Zionists, no. 3, June, 1899, under the title, George Eliot as a Zionist.

[28] Essay xviii of The Impressions of Theophrastus Such, reprinted in the Publ. of the Fed. of American Zionists, no. 5.

[29] Joseph Jacobs in Macmillan's Magazine for 1877; reprinted in Jewish Ideals, p. 80.

[30] David Kaufmann in Monatsschrift, 1877, p. 266.

[31] There were undoubtedly exceptions, but they kept their peace before the larger public. As such, I might mention Mr. Gustav Cohen of Hamburg, who, in 1896, published, but for private circulation only, a pamphlet, Die Judenfrage und die Zukunft, which he had written in 1891 under the double influence of Daniel Deronda and the passage of the Russian Exiles on their way to America.

Chapter II

THE COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE

(pp. 48-59)

[1] Graetz, Geschichte, xi. 554; the translation is from the English ed., v. 672.

[2] Cited in Cohn, Some Problems of Modern Jewry, p. 15.

[3] All. Israél. Univ. Bulletin, 1869, p. 64.

[4] In general, see Fabius Schach, Eine auferstandene Sprache, Berlin, n. d.; N. Slousch[z], The Renascence of Hebrew Lit., Phila., 1909, p. 19. For Palestine in particular, see David Yellin, Die Renaissance der hebräischen Sprache in Palästina, in Die Welt, xiv., 1081 et seq.; English transl. in Zionist Work in Palestine, London, 1911, pp. 143 et seq.

[5] I cannot refrain from adding, in a note, the reasoned judgment of one of the latest—let me say, also, one of the sanest—observers, Mr. Sydney Brooks. To the adept as well as to the critic of Zionism the following words have a pregnant meaning: "The Irish party has consistently acted on the principle that the salvation of Ireland is to be wrought by speeches and manoeuvers in the House of Commons; it has neglected the intellectual, moral, and, in a large part, the economic progress of the country in order to devote its exclusive power to the constitutional panacea. . . . The New Ireland, on the other hand, relies for the upbuilding of the country and its people upon the practical work of Irishmen in Ireland, scouts the notion that the Irish question is a question of politics merely, and insists that the task of betterment should no longer be postponed until an Irish Parliament is able to take it in hand." See his Aspects of the Irish Question, London, 1912, p. 87. On the excellent work done by Sir Horace Plunkett in this connection, see an informing article in the Monthly Review, Jan. 1906, and in Sydney Brooks, The New Ireland, 1907, p. 42.

[6] Lo shinnu et-leshonam, Mekilta, § 5, beginning; Shemot Rabba to Exod. ii. 11, and parallels.

Chapter III

LEO PINSKER AND AUTOEMANCIPATION

(pp. 60-81)

[1] First ed. 1882; 2d ed. Brünn, 1903; transl. into English by Albert A. L. Finkenstein, Self-Emancipation, London, 1891; and by David S. Blondheim, The Maccabaean, x. 91 et seq. Comp.

Pinsker and His Brochure, by Ahad ha-Am, transl. by Henrietta Szold, Baltimore, n. d.

[2] Comp. the words of Nietzsche: "Valeur de l'antisémitisme: d'amener les juifs à se poser des fins plus élevées et à trouver répugnante l'idée de l'absorption par les états." Oeuvres posthumes, xiii. 355.

[3] A very thoughtful and sympathetic study of Lilienblum has been made by Leon Simon, Moses Leib Lilienblum, Cambridge (England), 1912.

[4] A somewhat remarkable collection of letters and opinions on this subject has been put together by Abraham Jacob Slutzky, in his Sefer Shibhat Ziyyon, 2d ed., Warsaw, 1899.

[5] A short account of the activity of the Chovevi Zion will be found in an article by S. Ravikovitch, entitled The Palestine Committee in Odessa: Its Origin, Development, and Activity, published in The Maccabaean, xiii. 16 et seq. See also M. Glücksohn, Das Werk der Chowewe-Zion, in the Palestine number of Die Welt, xiv. 1088 et seq.; in the English translation, Zionist Work in Palestine, pp. 157 et seq.

[6] 1889, Adar Sheni 12; republished in Al Parashat Derakim, Odessa, 1895, pp. 1 et seq.

[7] See Selected Essays by Ahad ha-Am, transl. by Leon Simon, Phila., 1912, pp. 311 et seq.; comp. pp. 125 et seq.

[8] For the foregoing, see the illuminating presentment by Henrietta Szold in The Maccabaean, viii. 207 et seq.

[9] A faithful picture of the early colonies is given and a warning note sounded as early as 1878 by Fishel Rosenzweig, in Ha-Zefirah, no. 33, August 27 of that year. The warning was repeated by the same writer in Ha-Asif, ii. 182 et seq., under the title We'alu Moshi'im. A detailed history of the individual colonies will be found in Curt Nawratzki, Die jüdische Kolonisation Palästinas, 1914, pp. 110 et seq.

Chapter IV

THEODOR HERZL

(pp. 82-107)

[1] First ed. 1896. Since then it has appeared in numerous editions as well as in Theodor Herzl's Zionistische Schriften, Berlin, 1905.

[2] See Jewish Chronicle, July 10, 1896, p. 3. It was at this meeting that Lucien Wolf declared the scheme to be *practical*, but not *practicable* (ibidem, p. 9). At a later time Mr. Wolf joined hands with Zangwill in pursuing the policy of the Ito, holding that Zionism had failed because it attached itself "to one territory." See Jewish Chronicle, Jan. 12, 1906, p. 36.

[3] It is said that this designation was first used by Birnbaum (Matthias Acher) in his article Selbst-Emanzipation. See Ost und West, 1902, p. 576; Ahad ha-Am, Al Parashat Derakim, Berlin, 1903, p. 93.

[4] Eng. transl. by Sylvie d'Avigdor, London, 1896; 2d ed. by J. de Haas, New York, 1904. Translations have appeared in French, Hebrew, Judeo-German, Russian, and Bulgarian.

[5] "I had not intended to commence a personal agitation for the Jewish cause." Selbstbiographie, in Gesammelte Schriften, i. 18; Jewish Chronicle, Jan. 14, 1898, p. 20.

[6] Protokoll des Siebenten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 9; English, in The Maccabaean, ix. 113.

[7] The only authority I have for this statement is Lucien Wolf in his article, Zionism, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

[8] Protokoll . . . des Zweiten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 222: "Der Zionismus unternimmt nichts, was dem Religionsgesetze des Judenthums widerspricht."

[9] Oesterreichische Wochenschrift, April 23, 1897.

[10] Die Welt, ii. no. 48, p. 7.

[11] "There are some theologians who assume the Messianic period to be the most perfect state of civilization, but do not believe in the restoration of the Kingdom of David, the rebuilding of the

Temple, or the repossession of Palestine by the Jews. They altogether reject the national hope of the Jews. These theologians either misinterpret or wholly ignore the teaching of the Bible, and the divine promises made through the men of God." The Jewish Religion, 2d ed., 1900, p. 161.

[12] Dina de-Malkuta Dina. Baba Kamma, 113a, etc.

[13] "Zionism would have us return to the primitive stage of a national religion." Karpeles, Jews and Judaism in the Nineteenth Century, Phila., 1905, p. 63.

[14] See his National-Judenthum, Leipzig and Vienna, 1897.

[15] See his article, with its suggestive title, The Zionist Peril, in Jew. Quart. Rev. xvii. 1-25.

[16] See his address in The Judaeans, 1897-1899, pp. 68 et seq.

[17] ibidem, pp. 86 et seq.

[18] Aspects of the Jewish Question, London, 1902, p. 18.

[19] Year Book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis for 1897-1898, p. xli.

[20] See Die Stimme der Wahrheit, Berlin, 1905, pp. 165 et seq.

[21] Jew. Quart. Rev. xv. 501; comp. also ibidem, xvi. 48.

[22] ibidem, xvii. 342.

[23] The protest was published in the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, no. 29, July 16, 1897, and was signed by Maybaum (Berlin), Horowitz (Frankfort), Guttmann (Breslau), Auerbach (Halberstadt), and Werner (Munich), as the Vorstand des Rabbiner-Verbandes in Deutschland. It ought to be added that this action on the part of the Vorstand was taken without consultation of the whole body which it represented. See Rülf, Erklärung gegen Erklärung, in Die Welt, i. no. 7. Assent to the "protest" was obtained from the Rabbinerversammlung at its meeting in 1898 only by an unparliamentary stifling of the discussion. I may be pardoned for citing the answer to this protest published by my father, the late Gustav Gottheil, in the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums for Sept. 3, 1897. See also Herzl, Gesammelte Zionistische Schriften, i. 211, Protestrabbiner.

Chapter V

THE JEWISH CONGRESS

(pp. 108-142)

[1] I Sam. viii.

[2] Certain special honors shown in the synagogue to descendants of priestly and Levitic families are merely reminiscent.

[3] The expression is that of Doctor Solomon Schechter.

[4] The protest had been made the first time by Mr. Ambassador Straus; it was renewed on Nov. 19, 1898, by the same ambassador to Tewfik Pasha in these words: "The United States does not make any discrimination between its citizens based upon religion or race, nor will it concede to any other government the right or power to make any such discrimination in respect to American citizens." See United States Senate Reports, Foreign Relations, for 1898-1899, p. 1092. This protest is reasserted in a letter of Mr. Secretary Hay to Mr. Chargé d'Affaires Griscom, dated Feb. 28, 1901. See Foreign Relations for that year, p. 517. The regulations, dated respectively Feb. 23, 1888, and Nov. 21, 1901, will be found in George Young, Corps de droit ottoman, Oxford, 1905, ii. 156.

[5] On this Cyprus project see the notes I have gathered in Jewish Encyclopedia, iv. 401, and Zionistisches A-B-C Buch, Berlin, 1908, pp. 165 et seq. It should be noted that Herzl himself was not unfavorably disposed and regarded it as an "ultima ratio, wenn wir nicht reüssieren, und eine mitlaufende Kombination, wenn wir reüssieren"; ibidem, p. 167.

[6] See Protokoll . . . des Sechsten Zionisten-Kongresses, Wien, 1903, p. 6.

[7] See issue of July 17, 1903, p. 6.

[8] See the text of the whole letter in Die Welt, Aug. 27, 1903, p. 1; English transl. in The Maccabaean, v. 250.

[9] See the Blue Book containing the Report of the Work of the Commission Sent out by the Zionist Organization to Examine the Territory Offered by H. M. Government, etc., London, 1905, p. 4.

[10] See the London Times, Aug. 28, and Sept. 2, 1903. A little

later Sir H. H. Johnston in a measure changed his view. See Die Welt, 1904, no. 42.

[11] i e., J[ewish] T[erritorial] O[rganization] in the Judeo-German pronunciation.

[12] See his Dreamers in Congress, in Dreamers of the Ghetto, pp. 430 et seq.

[13] New Liberal Review, i. 615; from which article the two following quotations are also taken.

[14] Protokoll . . . des Fünften Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 325; Jewish Chronicle, London, Jan. 3, 1902, reprinted in The Maccabaean, ii. 64 et seq. See also Zangwill's speech at the Shoreditch Town Hall, reported in Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 7, 1902.

[15] "Whichever way the next Congress decides, the real traitor will be he who does not loyally accept the decision, and work heart and soul with the majority," he said on Shekel Day, 1904. In speaking at the Jewish Workingman's Club in London, he added, "What is necessary is that the minority should abide by the vote of the majority; that is peace."

Chapter VI

THE POST-HERZLIAN PERIOD

(pp. 143-164)

[1] See Werner, Die jüdischen Studentenverbindungen in Oesterreich, in Ost und West, 1901, pp. 415 et seq.; Zionistisches A-B-C Buch, p. 246.

[2] See Albert Friedenberg, Zionist Studies, New York, 1904, pp. 23 et seq.; Zionistisches A-B-C Buch, pp. 243 et seq. Note also the Jewish gymnastic societies in Munich, Berlin, Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Freiburg, Posen, Leipzig, Mannheim, and Breslau, and their publications, Jüdische Turnzeitung and Vereinsliederbuch.

[3] I give the figures on the authority of a correspondent in the Jewish Chronicle, London, Aug. 9, 1912, p. 11.

[4] Protokoll des Neunten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 239.

[5] Protokoll des Siebenten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 71.

[6] e. g., Palästina Handelsgesellschaft, Palestine Land Development Company, German-Levant Wool Company, Oelbaumspende, Siedlungsgenossenschaft (according to the plan of Doctor Franz Oppenheimer).

[7] Especially during the years 1909 and 1910.

[8] Carmel. The paper has since ceased publication. It is significant that the author of Le reveil de la nation arabe (Paris, 1905), Negib Azoury, had in preparation a work entitled Le péril juif universel.

[9] And by the editor of the leading Judeo-Spanish weekly in Turkey. See, *inter alia,* Die Welt, xvi. 139.

[10] See the issues of the Times (London), July 11, 12, 13; Aug. 3, 15, 31, 1911. The editor of the Vienna newspaper Die Zeit was evidently privy to the attack.

[11] See the Constantinople daily paper Stamboul, 1911, nos. 52, 54, 56, 91, 115, 267, etc.

[12] Autoemancipation, 2d ed., p. 28.

[13] See Sapir, Der Zionismus, p. 107.

[14] Protokoll des Ersten Zionisten-Kongresses, 2d ed., p. 18; English in Jewish Chronicle, Sept. 3, 1897, p. 11.

[15] Protokoll des Dritten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 6; English in Jewish Chronicle, Aug. 18, 1899, p. 12.

[16] Protokoll des Siebenten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 25; English in Jewish Chronicle, Aug. 4, 1905, p. 16; The Maccabaean, ix. 88.

[17] Protokoll des Achten Zionisten-Kongresses, p. 9; English in Jewish Chronicle, Aug. 16, 1907, p. 16.

Chapter VII

SOME PHASES OF ZIONISTIC THEORY

(pp. 165-180)

[1] Comp. the differing resolutions on anti-militarism proposed by the Germans and the French at the International Socialist Congress of Stuttgart in 1907 in the official Report, p. 404, and Vorwärts for April 26, 1907, for pronouncements in the Reichstag.

[2] Manifesto of the Communist Party, Chicago, n. d., p. 41.

[3] Jewish Chronicle, June 26, 1903, p. 10.

[4] ibidem, Dec. 22, p. 29; Dec. 29, p. 14.

[5] The theories of the Poale Zion are well set forth in Protokoll des Achten Zionisten-Kongresses, pp. 305 et seq. Comp. also Pasmanik, Die Theorie des Poale Zion, Berlin, n. d. As an offshoot might be mentioned the Ha-Poël ha-Zaïr, an organization of workingmen in Russia and Palestine, who are perhaps more Zionistic in their tendency than the Poale Zion.

[6] See Oppenheimer, Die Siedlungsgenossenschaft, Leipzig, 1896; Ländliche Kolonisation in Palästina, in Die Welt, xiii. 913 et seq. A fund of more than 100,000 francs has been subscribed in order to carry out the project of a co-operative settlement.

[7] Protokoll des Achten Zionisten-Kongresses, pp. 234-328.

[8] Protokoll des Neunten Zionisten-Kongresses, pp. 195 et seq., 509.

[9] Situated in Galilee; see Bericht des Actions-Comités . . . an den Zehnten Kongress, p. 42.

[10] I have the quotation from The Bund, published by the Central Verband of the Bund in America, New York, 1905 (?), p. 9. See also Die Tätigkeit des Allgem. jüdischen Arbeiterbundes, Geneva, 1904, pp. 23 et seq.; Sara Rabinowitsch, Die Organisationen des jüdischen Proletariats, 1903, passim; Jewish Chronicle, Jan. 13, 1905, p. 24; Die Welt, x. no. 34, p. 6.

[11] Protokoll, etc., p. 222.

[12] See Die Welt, xv. 953.

Chapter VIII

AHAD HA-AM AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF JEWISH HISTORY

(pp. 181-197)

[1] Preussische Jahrbücher, xliv. 572 et seq.; Herr Graetz und sein Judenthum, in Deutsche Kämpfe, Neue Folge, 1896, p. 37.

[2] He speaks of the "talmudistische Geschichtsschreiberei von

Graetz," Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum, 3er Abdruck, Berlin, 1880, p. 6; reprinted in Reden und Aufsätze, Berlin, 1905, pp. 410 et seq. See also the Memoir prefixed to the Index volume of Graetz, History, in the English translation, p. 77.

[3] See the preface to the first edition, p. x., and the last chapter, entitled Die Gegenwart.

[4] Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire du peuple juif, Paris, 1881; reprinted in his Les prophètes d'Israël, Paris, 1892, pp. 153 et seq.; transl. into German by J. Singer, Die Philosophie der Gesch. des jüd. Volkes, Vienna, 1884; and into English by Helen B. Jastrow, in Selected Essays of James Darmesteter, Boston, 1895, pp. 241 et seq. It is singular that this treatise, the most Jewish of all his writings, is not even mentioned in the article on him contributed by his wife to the Jewish Encyclopedia, iv. 444.

[5] loc. cit., p. 243.

[6] loc. cit., p. 275.

[7] Chto Takoe Yevreiskaya Istoria, in Voskhod, 1893, pp. 9 et seq.; German transl., Die jüdische Geschichte . . . autorisierte Uebersetzung von I. F., Berlin, 1893; English transl., Jewish History, Phila., 1903. Comp. Israel Friedlaender, Dubnow's Theory of Jewish Nationalism, in The Maccabaean, viii. 243 et seq.

[8] See, e. g., Die Welt, vii. no. 1, p. 1; xi. 1317.

[9] See the translation of an article on the subject that appeared in Der Jude, in Die Welt, v. 30 and 31.

[10] Selected Essays by Ahad ha-Am, transl. by Leon Simon, Phila., 1912, p. 289.

[11] ibidem, p. 295.

[12] See above, chap. iv., note 8.

[13] Protokoll des Ersten Zionisten-Kongresses, 2d ed., 1911, p. 208.

[14] Selected Essays, p. 300.

[15] ibidem, p. 123.

Chapter IX

ZIONISM AND THE WESTERN JEWS

(pp. 198-216)

[1] Parerga und Paralipomena, Berlin, 1851, ii. 223: "Den vernünftigen Juden, welcher, alte Fabeln, Flausen und Vorurtheile aufgebend, durch die Taufe aus einer Genossenschaft heraustritt, die ihm weder Ehre noch Vortheil bringt (wenn auch in Ausnahmsfälle Letzteres vorkommt), muss ich durchaus loben, selbst wenn es ihm mit dem christlichen Glauben kein grosser Ernst seyn sollte."

[2] Von Hartmann, though against any proselytizing on the part of Christians, thinks it a pity that certain classes of Jews in Germany have ceased to have their children baptized. See Das Judenthum in Gegenwart und Zukunft, 1885, p. 37.

[3] Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum, 3d ed., Berlin, 1880, p. 15: "Ausserhalb dieser Schranken [i. e., des Christenthums] zu bleiben und innerhalb der Nation zu stehen ist möglich, aber schwer und gefahrvoll. . . . Aber es ist eine notorische Thatsache dass eine grosse Anzahl von Juden nicht durch Gewissensbedenken vom Uebertritt abgehalten wird. Sondern lediglich durch ganz andere Gefühle, die ich begreifen, aber nicht billigen kann." Comp. also von Treitschke, Deutsche Kämpfe, Neue Folge, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 37, 45.

[4] Jewish Chronicle, Jan. 26, 1900, p. 21.

[5] See Strassburger Post, Unterhaltungsblatt, Jan. 6, 1907. It is no wonder that Nöldeke is unfriendly to Zionist aspirations. See his article, Semitic Languages, in Encyl. Brit. xi ed. p. 622b.

[6] Die Erlösung des Judenthums, vol. cii, 1900, pp. 131-140.

[7] See Actes et conférences de la Société des Etudes Juives, 1887, p. cxxxii.

[8] At Richmond; see Twenty-fifth Annual Report, p. 403, and American Hebrew, New York, Jan. 26, 1912, p. 384.

[9] In this connection the correspondence between the Zionist Actions Comité and the president of the Alliance Israélite in reference to combined action is most instructive. See Die Welt, xv. 334 et seq.

[10] See Spectator, London, Oct. 6, 1906, p. 478.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The literature on Zionism is very extensive, and is scattered in a large number of general and special periodicals. A Bibliography in Russian has been published by Belkowsky, Ukazatel literaturi o Sionisme, St. Petersburg, 1903. A Bibliography of Hebrew publications on the subject has been printed by William Zeitlin, Bibliotheca Sionista, in Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie, xii. 52 et seq., and has been issued in the form of a reprint.

A general history of the movement has been attempted in the Jewish Encyclopedia and in the Encyclopaedia Britannica; in a shorter form also in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia. A good reference work, alphabetically arranged, is the Zionistisches A-B-C Buch, herausgegeben . . . . von der Zionistischen Vereinigung für Deutschland, Berlin, 1908. A history of Zionism (but only down to 1903) has been attempted by J. B. Sapir, Der Zionismus . . . . autorisierte Uebersetzung von A. Benjamin, Brünn, 1903. For Russia, see E. Deinard, Dibre ha-Yamim le-Ziyyon be-Russia, 2 parts, Kearney (N. J.), 1904. The most trustworthy sources are the files of the official Zionist publication Die Welt (since 1897); and the "Protokolls" of the ten Congresses, an index to which has been published by Hugo Schachtel, Register zu den Protokollen der Zionisten-Kongresse i-vi., Berlin, 1905. A collection of Essays on a variety of subjects connected with the Zionist movement will be found in Die Stimme der Wahrheit, ed. E. Nossig, Berlin, 1905, and in the various brochures published by the Federation of American Zionists. Of the rest of the literature only a few titles can be mentioned:

Herzl, Theodor, Gesammelte zionistische Schriften, 2 vols., Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1905.

Nordau, Max, Zionistische Schriften, Köln, 1909.

Hess, Moses, Jüdische Schriften, herausgegeben von Th. Zlocisti, Berlin, 1905.

Pinsker, Leo, Autoemancipation, 2d ed., Brünn, 1903.

Nawratzki, Curt, Die jüdische Kolonisation Palästinas, Munich, 1914.

Neufeld, A., Der Versuch einer Bibliographie für die Zwecke der wirtschaftlichen Erschliessung Palästinas, Vienna, 1901.

Zionist Work in Palestine, by various authorities, ed. by Israel Cohen, London, 1911.

Heman, F., Das Erwachen der jüdischen Nation, Basel, 1897.

Jaffé, Max, Die nationale Wiedergeburt der Juden, Berlin, 1897.

Kronberger, Emil, Zionisten und Christen, Leipzig, 1900.

Zangwill, Israel, Zionism, in Lippincott's Monthly Magazine, October, 1899.

Philippson, M., Neueste Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, vol. ii.

INDEX

Abdul Hamid, Sultan, in communication with Herzl, 93; Turkey under, 117; Herzl's negotiations with, without result, 118-119, 128; granting of Constitution by, 156; alluded to, 163.

Actions Committee. See Central Committee.

Adler, Felix, promoter of a universalistic movement, 26.

Adler, Samuel, and the Jewish law, 106.

Africa, the Jews of, and Napoleon's Jewish nationalist plan, 39.

Agricultural colonies in Palestine, 76-77; suffering in, 77; under the Jewish Colonization Association, 81; opposed by the Germans, 158. See also Palestine, the colonization of.

Ahad ha-Am (Asher Ginzberg), criticises the Chovevi Zion movement, 74-75; adherents of, 75; founds a society, 75-76; insists upon understanding with Constantinople, 161; the Democratic Fraction follower of, 168; a student of philosophy, 188; in sympathy with the Jewish people, 188; theory of, on Jewish unrest, 189; on Jewish national feeling, 189 *et seq.;* on Palestine as a cultural center, 190 *et seq.;* opposes Zionism, 191-192, 195-197; advocates revival of Hebrew, 193, 194; criticism of, 195-197.

Ahad ha-Amism, a phase of Zionist thought, 180. See Ahad ha-Am.

Ahiasaf, publication society, a Bene Mosheh creation, 76.

Akademische Lesehalle, Berlin, excludes Jews, 148.

Albanians, the, in Turkey, 159.

Alliance Israélite Universelle, the, refuses to interest itself in Palestine colonization, 42; the founders of, 50; motives underlying foundation of, 51; founds the Mikweh Israel Agricultural School, 54; merits and demerits of, 54; part assigned to, by Pinsker, 65; purely philanthropic, 79; hostile to Zionism, 95; fails to organize international Jewry, 109; to be represented in organization proposed at Palestine Congress, 133; Zangwill on, 139; exerts influence against Zionism, 159-160; expected to be an organizing force, 214.

Allianz, the, of Vienna, part assigned to, by Pinsker, 65; hostile to Zionism, 95.

Alroy, nationalist tendencies in Disraeli's, 40; quotation from, 40.

Am Olam, work by Perez Smolenskin, 34.

America, Jewish emigration to, deprecated by Lilienblum, 67-68. See also United States.

American Judaism, 205.
Ancona, alluded to, 203.
Anglo-Egyptian Government, the, and Jewish colonization of El-Arish, 121-122.
Anglo-Jewish Association, the, refuses to interest itself in Palestine colonization, 42; part assigned to, by Pinsker, 65.
Anglo-Levantine Company, the, at Constantinople, 158.
Angola, Jews invited to settle in, 125; colonization contemplated in, by the Ito, 141.
Anti-Semitism, modern, originated by Bismarck, 26-27; how combated, 27-28; not founded on theoretical considerations, 27; detrimental effect of, on Jews, 30; strikes at the social position of Jews, 60; causes pogroms in Russia, 60-61; causes economic distress in Galicia, 61; effect of, on Jews in general, 61; self-emancipation true answer to, 64; Herzl sensitive to, 85; England not affected by, 86; Herzl's reply to, 88; an increasing menace, 89; calls Jews strangers, 101; rampant in Vienna, 147; at the German universities, 148; directed against Jewish historians, 181; ravages of, 205.
Arab dominion, in Palestine, hostile to Jews, 48.
Arabs, the, anti-Jewish campaign of, 158-159; in Turkey, 159; tillers of the soil in Palestine, 169.
Argentina, alluded to, 91.
Armenian massacres, the, alluded to, 93.
Art, in Palestine, 194.
Arukat Bat Ammi, work by Rülf, 70; forerunner of the *Judenstaat*, 89.
Asher ben Yehiel, alluded to, 201.
Ashkenazim, the, use Judeo-German, 57; alluded to, 201.
Asia, the Jews of, and Napoleon's Jewish nationalist plan, 39.
Assimilation, Levanda on, 69.
Association of Rabbis in Germany, the, on Zionism, 103-104.
Athlit, alluded to, 155.
Australia, colonization in, contemplated by the Ito, 141.
Austria, alluded to, 59; the Chovevi Zion movement in, 72; home of Herzl, 84; German, originates the Jewish nationalist university movement, 147; students' societies in, 147-148.
Austria, the Jews of, harmful effect of anti-Semitism on, 30; anti-Semitism strikes at social position of, 60; in Austrian politics, 144-145.
Austria-Hungary, lack of racial unity in, 210-211.
Autoemancipation, work by Leo Pinsker, 64-66; influences Lilienblum, 67; influences Rülf, 70; forerunner of Herzl's *Judenstaat*, 82, 83, 89; compared with Herzl's *Judenstaat*, 83; text-book of the Kadimah, 147.
Avignon, alluded to, 203.

Babylon, alluded to, 110.
Babylonian Jews, the, alluded to, 201.
Balkan states, the, manifest national consciousness, 24; in the Berlin Conference, 60..
Bari, alluded to, 203.

Basel, meeting place of the First Zionist Congress, 113, 114.
Basel Program, the, 114-116; demands a home for the Jews, 126; and colonization outside of Palestine, 135; criticised by Ahad ha-Am, 192.
Bayazid II, Sultan, invites the Jews to settle in Turkey, 125.
Beirut, alluded to, 118.
Belief, the Jewish, and the Reformers, 22.
Bene Mosheh, the, society founded by Ahad ha-Am, 75-76; daughter institutions of, 76; alluded to, 196.
Benedictus Levita, advises Jews to educate children as Christians, 206.
Bergson, quoted, 14.
Berlin, the Jews of, refuse to be interested in Palestine colonization, 42; Orthodox Jews of, favorable to colonization of Palestine, 70-71; alluded to, 72; Jewish students' societies at, 148, 149; the seat of the Actions Committee, 151.
Berlin Conference, the, and the Jews of the Balkan states, 60.
Bernstein, a Jew and a socialist, 167.
Bezalel School, the, at Jerusalem, supported by Palestine sentiment, 155; for arts, 194.
Bielitz, Jewish students' society at, 148.
Birnbaum, Nathan, founds the Kadimah at Vienna, 86.
Bismarck, author of modern anti-Semitism, 26-27; supposed to entertain Jewish nationalist plans, 39-40.
Blood accusation. See Damascus.
Bnei Zion associations, connected with the Chovevi Zion movement, 72.
Boer War, the, alluded to, 123.
Boers, the, remain Dutchmen, 212.
Bonn, Jewish students' societies at, 148.
Bosnia, alluded to, 157.
Breslau, Jewish students' society at, 148; first official Zionist students' society at, 149.
British citizenship, and the Boers, 212.
British Government, the, good-will of, valued by Herzl, 122.
Brooks, Sydney, on the New Ireland, 221.
Brünn, Jewish students' society at, 148.
Brussels Conference, the, unsuccessful as an organizing agency, 214-215.
Buffalo, New York, alluded to, 39.
Bulgaria, alluded to, 157.
Bulgarian, the revival of, 56, 57.
Bulgarians, the, in Turkey, 159.
Bund jüdischer Akademiker, federation of Jewish students' societies, 149.
Bund jüdischer Jugendvereine, federation of juvenile societies, 150.
Bund jüdischer Korporationen, federation of Jewish students' societies, 149.
Bund, the, Jewish nationalistic sentiment in, 172; why formed as a Jewish section of the Russian proletarian movement, 173; cherishes the Russian rather than the Jewish national ideal, 173; refuses to assimilate completely, 173-174; breaks with the Russian Workingmen's Democratic Party, 174;

recognizes its Jewish nationalist character, 175; reproach of, against Zionism, 175; capitulates to the Democratic Party, 176.

Cabalistic activity, attracts settlers to Palestine, 49.
Cairo, alluded to, 121.
Canada, growth of, and national consciousness, 24; alluded to, 54, 91; colonization in, contemplated by the Ito, 141; an example of racial diversity, 212.
Carcassone, alluded to, 203.
Carmel Wine Company, the, a Bene Mosheh creation, 76.
Carpentras, alluded to, 203.
Cassel, Paulus (Selig), alluded to, 182.
Castile, alluded to, 57.
Center, a, value of, 207.
Central Committee, demonstration of members of, against East African proposal, 131; report to, 131; Russian members of, meet at Kharkoff, 133; seat of, in Berlin, 151.
Central Conference of American Rabbis, the, on Zionism, 102.
Ceremonial law, the Jewish, and the Reformers, 21-22.
Chamberlain, Joseph, and a Jewish settlement in East Africa, 123.
Charter, a, proposed by Herzl, 90.
Charterism, killed by the Turkish Constitution, 157; characterized, 157.
Chauvinism, a mark of the new nationalism, 26.
Chief Rabbi, the, of England, without power religiously, 110.
Chovevi Zion movement, the, headed by Pinsker, 72; spread of, 72; attempt to federate societies of, 72; superseded by Zionism, 73; criticised by Ahad ha-Am, 74-75; influence of the Bene Mosheh on, 76; gives impetus to agricultural settlement in Palestine, 77; groups within, 78; enlists other societies in Palestine colonization, 79; not known to Herzl, 91; in Western Europe, hostile to Zionism, 95; and Zionism, 104; opposed by Herzl, 116-117; a threat to Zionism as a national movement, 156; too practical, 196. See also Odessa Committee; Hibbat Zion; Palestine, the colonization of; Palestinian Zionism.
Chovevi Zionists, the, insist upon Palestine work, 119; East African proposal apt to alienate, 127; opposed to the East African proposal, 129.
Christ, second coming of, and Jewish nationalism, 41.
Christian community, a universal, and the Roman Church, 23; and the Jews, 25.
Christian dominion in Palestine, hostile to Jews, 48.
Christian-Socialist Party, Jews naturally barred from, 168.
Christianity, conversions to, in Germany, 150; conversion to, advised by writers and historians, 206.
Christians, German, oppose anti-Semitism, 27; sympathizers with Jewish nationalism, 39-47.
Cities, influence of growth of, on Jewish unity, 203.
Citizenship, and religion in Rome, 25; not coincident with racial unity, 210-212.

Claude, character in play by Alexandre Dumas fils, 42.
Cohen, Gustav, influenced by George Eliot, 220.
Cohen, Hermann, on Palestine, 217.
Cohn, Albert, interested in the Jews of the East, 50; alluded to, 52.
Collectors of alms, link between Palestine and the Diaspora, 49.
Cologne, seat of Zionism, 145.
Colonial Trust. See Jewish Colonial Trust, the.
Colonization, the, of Palestine. See Palestine, the colonization of.
Commandment, developed from custom, 71.
Congress, the Zionist, an expression of Pinsker's ideas, 66; indicates organization, 108; a Jewish forum, 111; ten sessions of, held, 116; parties in, 170 *et seq.;* theoretical debates in, 172.
Congress, the Zionist (First), the beginning of Herzl's constructive policy, 93; takes Zionism out of the sphere of academic discussion, 94; universal character of, 112-113; meets in Basel, 113-114; opposition to, 113-114; platform adopted by, 114; advocates loyal intercourse with Turkey, 161; society for the study of Hebrew proposed at, 193.
Congress, the Zionist (Second), defines attitude of movement towards religion, 97; debates on organization in, 172.
Congress, the Zionist (Third), frowns upon Cyprus colonization, 120; favors loyal intercourse with Turkey, 162.
Congress, the Zionist (Fifth), alluded to, 168; Democratic Fraction formed at, 176.
Congress, the Zionist (Sixth), East African proposal at, 126 *et seq.*, 128-131; an opposition party formed in, 132 *et seq.*
Congress, the Zionist (Seventh), resolutions of, accepted by the Odessa Committee of the Chovevi Zion, 73; address on Herzl at, 92; the East African proposal before, 135 *et seq.;* Palestinian Zionism at, 154; favors loyal intercourse with Turkey, 162-163.
Congress, the Zionist (Eighth), favors loyal intercourse with Turkey, 163.
Congress, the Zionist (Ninth), accepts theories of the Poale Zion, 170.
Congress, the Zionist (Tenth), discusses emigration, 142; Palestinian Zionism victorious at, 154; admits groupings based on theory, 172; Mizrachi demands at, 178, 179.
Coningsby, nationalist tendencies in Disraeli's, 40.
Consciousness, the Jewish, deadened in modern times, 205.
Conservatives, the, a party in Great Britain, 171.
Constantinople, alluded to, 121, 158; the Jews of, ultra-Turkish in sympathy, 159.
Conversion to Christianity, advised by writers and historians, 206.
Conversions to Christianity, in Germany, 150.
Cornwall, dialect of, extinct, 57.

Cosmopolitanism, supposed guarantee for welfare of Jews, 62. See also Internationalism.
Crémieux, Adolphe, intervenes in the Damascus blood accusation, 49-50; one of the founders of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, 50; example of a modern Jewish statesman, 92.
Cretans, the, alluded to, 157.
Croats, in Austria-Hungary, 211.
Cromer, Earl of, on Rome and the Jews, 218.
Culture, Jewish, in Palestine, Ahad ha-Am on, 190 *et seq.*
Custom, developed into commandment, 71.
Cymric, the revival of, 56-57.
Cyprus, stepping-stone to Palestine colonization, 120; for Jewish colonization, 120, 121.
Cyrenaica, colonization in, contemplated by the Ito, 141.
Czechs, in Germany and Austria-Hungary, 211.
Czernowitz, Jewish students' society at, 148.
Dahlemia. See Freie Verbindung Dahlemia.
Damascus, center of Maronite massacres, 50.
Damascus blood accusation, the, influences Moses Hess, 36-37; history of, 49-50.
Danes, in Germany, 211.
Daniel, character in play by Alexandre Dumas fils, 42.
Daniel Deronda, novel by George Eliot, on Jewish nationalism, 43-45; Jewish opinions of, 46-47.
Darmesteter, James, a philosophy of Jewish history by, 184-186; how disqualified for his task, 184; quotation from work of, 185; personal note lacking in work of, 185-186; alluded to, 188.
Darmstadt, Jewish students' societies at, 148.
Delamere, Lord, telegram of, on East African proposal, 131.
Democracy, cherished by Jews, 109-111.
Democratic Fraction, the, of the Congress, opposed to the East African proposal, 129; gives rise to the Poale Zion party, 168; follower of Ahad ha-Am, 168; represented at the Minsk Congress, 168; merged into the Poale Zion, 168; demands of, accepted by official Zionism, 170; formation of, 176; effect of, 176; and the Mizrachi, 177.
Derek ha-Hayyim, article by Ahad ha-Am, 74-75.
Derishat Ziyyon, pamphlet, by Hirsch Kalischer, 53-54.
"Deutsche Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens," 205.
Diaspora, the. See Dispersion, the Jewish.
Discoveries, and internationalism, 24.
Dispersion, the Jewish, as viewed by the Reformers, 22-23; and Jerusalem, 30; held by Reform to be providential, 99; favored by the Ito movement, 142; to be feared, 215-216.
Disraeli, as a Jewish nationalist, 40; example of a modern Jewish statesman, 92.
Djavid Bey, said to be tool of Jews, 160; ignorant of Zionism, 161.
Dönmeh, follower of Sabbataï Zebi, 160.

Dreyfus affair, the, Herzl in Paris during, 85.
Druses, the, massacre Maronite Christians, 50.
Dubnow, Simon, a philosophy of Jewish history by, 186-188; qualifications of, for task, 186; lays stress on universal aspects of Jewish history, 186-187; message of, 187-188; alluded to, 188.
Dumas, Alexandre, fils, on Jewish nationalism, 41-42.
Dunant, Henry, founder of the Red Cross, sympathizer with Jewish nationalism, 42-43.

East African proposal, the, compared with Noah's, 39; how originated, 123-124; an epoch in Jewish history, 124-125; tempting features of, 125; acceptable terms of, defined by Herzl, 125-126; made on the eve of the Sixth Congress, 126; apt to alienate the Chovevi Zionists, 127; as viewed by Herzl, 127-128; attitude of the Jewish Colonization Association toward, 128; presented to the Congress by Herzl, 128-129; opposition to, 129, 130-131, 131-132; commission of inquiry on, 129-130, 131; report on, 131; produces lines of cleavage in the Congress, 132 *et seq.;* before the Seventh Zionist Congress, 135 *et seq.;* causes split in Zionism, 136-137.
East, the Jews of the, interest taken in, by the Jews of Europe, 50; Spanish used in the Semitic, 57. See also Eastern Jews.
Eastern Europe, ascendancy of Judeo-German in, 57-58.
Eastern Jews, exodus of, 30-31; influence Western Jews, 31-34; compared with Western Jews, 77-78. See also East.
Economic questions, parties formed on the basis of, 171 *et seq.*
Egypt, alluded to, 54.
Ehrenpreis, Doctor, proposes society for study of Hebrew, 193.
El-Arish, proposed Jewish colonization of, 120-122, 123.
Eliot, George, on Jewish nationalism, 43-47; Zangwill on, 138; influences Gustav Cohen, 220.
Emancipation, political, and Western Jews, 19-20; and the Reformers, 20; Moses Hess on, 37; does not include social emancipation, 64; Zionism supposed to be incongruous with, 198-199; cost of, 209.
Emanuel, Temple, New York, alluded to, 106.
Emigration regulated by the Ito movement, 141; at the Tenth Zionist Congress, 142.
Emunah Yesharah, work by Kalischer, 52-53.
Encyclopedists, the French, favor internationalism, 24.
Engels. See Marx and Engels.
England, alluded to, 59, 204; the Chovevi Zion movement in, 72; not affected by anti-Semitism, 86; Herzl looks to Jews of, for support, 87; and Cyprus, 120. See also Great Britain; London.
Eternal People, An, work by Perez Smolenskin, 34.
Exilarch, lay head of the Jewish community in Babylon, 110.

Extremism, a characteristic of the prophets, 192.
Ezra Verein, the, of Berlin, connected with the Chovevi Zion movement, 72; religious in sentiment, 79; to be represented in organization proposed at Palestine Congress, 133.

Florence, alluded to, 203.
France, alluded to, 59, 203.
Franck, Adolphe, on Jerusalem, 217.
Frankfort Conference, the, unsuccessful as an organizing agency, 214-215.
Frankfort-on-the-Main, Orthodox Jews of, favorable to colonization of Palestine, 70-71; Senate of, 103.
Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Palestine colonization society formed at, 55.
Freiburg, Jewish students' societies at, 148.
Freie Verbindung Dahlemia, Berlin students' society, 149.
French, the, in Canada, 212.
Friedländer, M., on Zionism, 98.

Gaelic, the revival of, 56.
Galicia, Jews from, settle in Palestine, 49.
Galicia, the Jews of, effect of anti-Semitism on, 61; affected by anti-Semitism, 27.
Galician Jewish students, in Vienna, 147.
Galilee, alluded to, 76; Jews in, during the Middle Ages, 49.
Galveston, emigration directed to, by the Ito movement, 141.
Geiger, Abraham, and the Jewish law, 106.
Geiger, Ludwig, on Zionism, 102, 103.
General Jewish Workingmen's Union of Russia and Poland. See Bund, the.
Geneva Convention, the, inspirer of, 42.
German patriotism, and Zionism, 102; leadership of Zionism, 151.
German Empire, the renewed, a manifestation of national consciousness, 24.
German universities, the, and Zionism, 146 *et seq.;* nurture Jewish idealism, 150-151.
Germans, in Austria-Hungary, 211; the, in Palestine, prejudiced against Zionism, 158; the, in the United States, 211.
Germany, anti-Semitism in, 27; alluded to, 59, 204; the Chovevi Zion movement in, 72; hostile to Zionism, 103; advantages of, as seat of Zionism, 145-146; Zionist development of, 146 *et seq.;* students' societies in, 148-150, 150-151; conversions to Christianity in, 150; lack of racial unity in, 210-211.
Germany, the Jews of, harmful effect of anti-Semitism on, 30; use Teutonized Hebrew, 56; anti-Semitism strikes at social position of, 60.
Ginzberg, Asher. See Ahad ha-Am.
Gordon, Moses Hess influenced by, 37.
Gottesdienstliche Vorträge, work by Zunz, 183.
Graetz, Heinrich, historian, influenced by Moses Hess, 38; quoted, 38; history of, at-

tacked, 181-182; alluded to, 182; on the Reform movement, 183.
Grand Island, New York, a refuge for Jews, 38-39.
Grand Rabbin de France, a government office, 110.
Gratz, Jewish students' society at, 148.
Great Britain, interest of, in a Jewish state, 41; party lines in Parliament of, 171. See also England; London.
Greeks, the, in Turkey, 159.
Greenberg, L. J., and the East African proposal, 123.
Guas Ngishu Plateau, territory concerned in the East African proposal, 131.
Güdemann, M., on the *Judenstaat*, 97; hostile to Zionism, 99-100; alluded to, 182.
Guttmacher, Moses Hess influenced by, 37.
Gymnasium, the Hebrew, at Jaffa, supported by Palestine sentiment, 155; grant to, opposed by the Mizrachi, 178, 179; faults of, 194; purpose of, 194.

Haffkine, Doctor, organizer of the Chovevi Zion movement, 72.
Haifa, alluded to, 155, 158, 159.
Hakam Bashi, spiritual head of Eastern Jewish communities, 110.
Hakki ministry, the, in Turkey, charged with Judaizing, 160.
Hakki Pasha, displays ignorance of Zionism, 161.
Halevi, Jehudah, quoted, 35.
Ha-Meliz, alluded to, 74; welcomes Zionism, 99.
Ha-Poël ha-Zaïr, offshoot of the Poale Zion, 228.
Hartmann, Eduard von, advises conversion to Christianity, 206.
Ha-Shiloah, magazine, a Bene Mosheh creation, 76.
Hasidism, alluded to, 110.
Haskalah movement, the, alluded to, 67.
Hayyim Gedaliah, advocates the purchase of Palestine, 67.
Ha-Zefirah, welcomes Zionism, 99.
Healing of My People, The, work by Rülf, 70.
Hebraism, prophetical, Ahad ha-Am preacher of, 192-193.
Hebrew language, the, in Noah's nationalist scheme, 39; Jewish nationalism awakens interest in, 55-59; superseded by various languages, 55-56, 57-58; official and literary use of, 56; development of, retarded, 56; secularization of, discountenanced, 58; cultivated by Jewish nationalists, 58-59; cultivated in Palestine, 59; cultivated by Jewish students' societies, 148; revival of, discussed at the First Congress, 193; in the Middle Ages, 203-204.
Heidelberg, alluded to, 78.
Hellenism, in relation to Judaism, 29-30; alluded to, 202.
Hellenists, alluded to, 103.
Herzegovina, alluded to, 157.
Herzfeld, alluded to, 182.
Herzl, Theodor, how qualified as a leader, 17-18; death of, 82, 134-135; forerunners of, 82-83; personality of, 83, 84; followers of, 83-84; education of, 84-85; career of, 85; returns to Vienna, 86; looks to English Jews for assistance, 86-87; and Zangwill, 87; in London, 87;

and anti-Semitism, 88; demands formation of a Society of Jews and a Jewish Company, 89-90; a practical statesman, 90-91, 91-92; why successful in the West, 91; devoted to the Jewish people, 92; Nordau on, 92; constructive policy of, 93; in diplomatic relations with the Turkish Sultan, 93-94, 156; indifferent to religious sentiment, 96; grows more Palestinian in attitude, 97, 115-116; political view of, 116-118; negotiations of, with Turkey, without result, 118-119; and the colonization of El-Arish, 121; values good-will of British Government, 122; alluded to, 124, 142; on the East African proposal, 125-126; difficult position of, 126-127; in Russia, 126-127; opinion of, on East African proposal, 127-128; presents the East African proposal to the Congress, 128-129; opposition to, at the Kharkoff Conference, 133-134; generosity of, 135; effect on movement of death of, 143-144; hostility to, in Vienna, 145; the Kadimah first to join, 148; doctrines of, espoused by the "politicals," 151-152; Ussischkin antagonizes, 153; favors loyal intercourse with Turkey, 161-162; opposes groupings in the Congress resting upon theory, 172; opposes introduction of religious considerations in official Zionist work, 179; on Judaism, 193.

Hess, Moses, as a Jewish nationalist, 36-38; quoted, 36-37; work by, 37-38; on political emancipation, 37; influences Graetz, 38; acknowledges indebtedness to Hirsch Kalischer, 53; Pinsker in agreement with, 63; forerunner of Herzl, 89; a Socialist, 168.

Hibbat Ziyyon, Palestine colonization movement, 67; finds no response in Western Europe, 69; espoused by Rülf, 69; in Russia, 71-72; the program of some Russian Zionists, 73; Ahad ha-Am seeks to enlarge idea of, 74-75; Ahad ha-Am leader in, 191. See also Chovevi Zion; Palestine, the colonization of.

Hildesheimer, Hirsch, leader of the Ezra Verein, 79.

Hill, Sir Clement, and the East African proposal, 123-124, 126.

Hindlipp, Lord, telegram of, on East African proposal, 131.

Historians, Jewish, attacked, 181; the task of, 182-183.

Hobebe Zion. See Chovevi Zion.

Holdheim, Samuel, and the Jewish law, 106.

Holland, alluded to, 97.

Hollingsworth, Christian sympathizer with Jewish nationalism, 40-41.

Holy Land, the. See Palestine.

Hyde Park, London, Kishineff protest meeting at, 167.

Immigration, counteracts ravages of anti-Semitism, 205.

India, overland route to, and a Jewish state in Palestine, 41.

Indian Ocean, the, boundary of East African Protectorate, 123.

Industrial system of modern times, the, breaks up Jewish unity, 202 *et seq.*

Inner Actions Committee. See Central Committee.
International Palestine Society, founded by Henry Dunant, 43.
Internationalism, and the Roman Church, 23-24; at the end of the Middle Ages, 24; and the Jews, 26; supposed guarantee for welfare of Jews, 62; and Socialism, 167. See also Cosmopolitanism.
Ireland, alluded to, 56, 57.
Ireland, The New, Sydney Brooks on, 221.
Irish-Americans, the, nationalists, 211-212.
Irish Party, the, in Great Britain, 171.
Italy, protests against the "red ticket," 118; alluded to, 203; the Jews of, use stilted Hebrew, 56.
Ito movement, the, origin of, 116; a secession from Zionism, 137; Zangwill leader of, 137; objects of, 137; difficulties encountered by, 141; a philanthropic movement, 141-142; promotes dispersion, 142. See also Zionistic Territorial Organization.
Jaffa, alluded to, 51, 55, 155, 158; a Mizrachi school at, 177.
Jerusalem, how viewed by the Jews of the Diaspora, 30; Napoleon plans to re-establish, 39; Jews in, during the Middle Ages, 49; a Mizrachi school at, 177.
Jewish Agricultural Experiment Station, the, at Athlit, supported by Palestine sentiment, 155.
Jewish Chronicle, the London, letter by Herzl in, 87-88; and the East African proposal, 123.
Jewish Colonial Trust, the, an expression of Pinsker's ideas, 66; established, 122; and the East African proposal, 124; moneys of, withheld from use in connection with the East African proposal, 131; action against, 140; London seat of, 145; use of funds of, 152; alluded to, 196.
Jewish Colonization Association, the, purely philanthropic, 79; as a factor in Palestine colonization, 81; hostile to Zionism, 95; attitude of, towards East African proposal, 128; to be represented in organization proposed at Palestine Congress, 133; Zangwill on, 139.
Jewish Company, a, proposed by Herzl, 90.
Jewish history, three attempts at a philosophy of, 148 *et seq.*
Jewish National Fund, the, an expression of Pinsker's ideas, 66; proposition to invest, wholly in land in Palestine, 153; gives land for the Siedlungsgenossenschaft, 170; alluded to, 196.
Jewish question, the, viewed optimistically, 100.
Jewish Territorial Organization, the. See Ito movement, the.
Jewish vote, the, in Austria and Hungary, 174.
Jews, the, in Rome, 24-25; and a universal Christian community, 25; and Protestantism, 25; and internationalism, 26; and nationalism, 26-27; under the modernizing process, 28-29; since the destruction of the Temple, 35; attitude of, towards return to Palestine, 35-

36; and Christian sympathizers with Jewish nationalism, 41; of Europe, interested in the Jews of the East, 50; anomalous position of, analyzed by Pinsker, 63-64; and assimilation, 69; individualistic, 109; invited to settle in various countries, 125; interested in Socialism, 167; compared with the Parsees, 184-185; united, 200 *et seq.;* unity of, broken under industrial system of modern times, 202 *et seq.;* the need of unity for, 207; duties of, in the Diaspora, 207-208.

Jchanan ben Zakkai, Zangwill on, 139.

Johnston, Sir H. H., telegram of, on East African proposal, 131.

Joseph of Naxos, example of a modern Jewish statesman, 92.

Jost, alluded to, 182.

Judaism, modified by the Reformers, 20-23; in relation to Hellenism, 29-30; free from sectarian schism, 201; equivalent to Zionism, 216.

Judaizing charge, a, against the Turkish Hakki ministry, 160.

Judea, alluded to, 76.

Judenstaat, by Herzl, doctrines in, not new, 82, 83; compared with Pinsker's *Autoemancipation,* 83; when and how written, 85-86; reception accorded to, 86; alluded to, 87; first edition of, 88; Herzl's reply to anti-Semitism, 88; forerunners of, 89; calmness of, 91; brought to the notice of the Sultan, 93; Güdemann on, 97.

Judeo-German, the, supersedes Hebrew, 56; ascendancy of, in Eastern Europe, 57-58; almost a national tongue, 58; works in, not known in Western Europe, 69-70; the language of the Bund, 175; superseded by Hebrew in Palestine, 194.

Jüdische Lesehalle, the, Berlin, a product of anti-Semitism, 148.

Kadimah, the, of Vienna, connected with the Chovevi Zion movement, 72; founded by Nathan Birnbaum, 86; Jewish nationalistic in sentiment, 86; adherent of Herzl, 86, 92; origin, aims, and influence of, 147-148; model for similar organizations, 148.

Kalischer, Hirsch, Moses Hess influenced by, 37; on the colonization of Palestine, 52-54; inspires Hess, 53; inspires Netter, 54; offered position in Mikweh Israel Agricultural School, 54; forms colony near Sea of Tiberias, 55.

Karaites, the, a Jewish sect, 201.

Kartell-Konvent, federation of Jewish students' societies, 149.

Kartell zionistischer Verbindungen, federation of Zionist students' societies, 149.

Kharkoff, Russian members of the Central Committee meet at, 133-134.

Kiev, alluded to, 78.

Kishineff protest meeting, Socialists do not participate in, 167.

Klein-Kolonisation, deprecated by the "politicals," 152.

Kohler, K., on Zionism, 100.

Königsberg, Jewish students' societies at, 148.

Köthen, Zionist society at, 149.

Kovno, alluded to, 66.

Kultur, the debate on, 176-177; and Judaism, discussions on, 193.
Kulturkampf, the, danger connected with, 179.
Kutzo-Vlachs, the, in Turkey, 159.

Laborers, Jewish, situation of, 165-166.
Laborites, the, a party in Great Britain, 171.
La femme de Claude, drama by Alexandre Dumas fils, 41-42.
Land-tenure, forbidden to Jews, 166.
Landesrabbiner, a state rather than a synagogue office, 110.
Language, a universal, a Jew invents, 26.
Language and nationalism, 56-57.
Lansdowne, Marquis of, and the East African proposal, 124.
Lassalle, Ferdinand, promoter of a universalistic movement, 26.
Latin, compared with Hebrew, 204.
Law, Jewish, Reform desires development of, 106.
Legislation concerning Jews, in Rome, 24-25; during the Middle Ages, 25.
Lemberg, Jewish students' society at, 148.
Levanda, O. L., on assimilation, 68-69; not known in Western Europe, 69; forerunner of Herzl, 82.
Lévy-Bing, Lazar, espouses Jewish nationalism, 219.
Liberals, the, a party in Great Britain, 171.
Lida, first annual meeting of Mizrachi at, 177.
Lilienblum, Moses Löb, alarmed by the spread of anti-Semitism, 61-62; favors Palestine colonization, 66-67; influenced by Pinsker, 67; works by, 67, 68; on emigration to America, 67-68; not known in Western Europe, 69; leader of the Chovevi Zion movement, 78; forerunner of Herzl, 82.
Lippe, K., supporter of the Chovevi Zion movement, 72.
Lo zeh ha-Derek, article by Ahad ha-Am, 74.
London, Herzl in, 87; lukewarm reception of Herzl by, 92; alluded to, 98, 121, 167; under consideration as Zionist center, 145.
London Conference, the, unsuccessful as an organizing agency, 214-215.
Luzzatti, example of a modern Jewish statesman, 92.
Luzzatto, Samuel David, quoted on Palestine, 52.

Maämar ha-Ishut, work by Samuel Holdheim, 106.
Maccabaea, the, first official Zionist students' society, 149.
Maccabaeans, the, London, invite Herzl, 87.
Magnus, Laurie, on Zionism, 101.
Magyars, in Austria-Hungary, 211.
Maimonides, Moses, and the return to Palestine, 35; alluded to, 202.
Mandelstamm, Professor, leader of the Chovevi Zion movement, 78.
Marburg, Jewish students' societies at, 148.
Maronite Christians, massacred by the Druses, 50.
Marx and Engels, manifesto by, international, 167.

Marx, Karl, promoter of a universalistic movement, 26; a Jew, 167; socialism of, international, 167. See also Marx and Engels.
May Laws, the, in Russia, 61, 62.
Mehemet Ali, sultan of Egypt, urged to intervene in the Damascus blood accusation, 49-50.
Melebbes. See Petah Tikwah.
Memel, alluded to, 69; a center of distribution of Russo-Jewish emigrants, 70.
Mendelssohn, Moses, attitude of, towards Judaism, 21-22; the descendants of, 22.
Mesopotamia, colonization in, contemplated by the Ito, 141.
Messianic idea, the, secularized by Smolenskin, 34; and Zionism, 96-97.
Messianism, in opposition to Zionism, 98.
Middle Ages, the, ritual changes during, 21; and internationalism, 23-24; legislation of, regarding the Jews, 25, 166; Jews in Palestine during, 48-49; favor individual groupings, 202; Hebrew in, 203-204.
Midrash, the, on a national language, 58.
Mikweh Israel Agricultural School, the, near Jaffa, alluded to, 51; founde. by Charles Netter, 54; fails to fulfil purpose, 54-55.
Minhag (custom), developed into mizwah (commandment), 71.
Minsk Zionist Congress, dominated by the practical Zionists, 150; the Democratic Fraction at, 168; the Kultur question discussed at, 176-177.
Mission, the Jewish, said to be in opposition to Zionism, 200 *et seq.*
Mizrachi, the, Orthodox Zionists, 97, 176; and the East African proposal, 135; the demands of, 177; foundation of, 177; institutions of, 177-178; well organized, 178; influence of, on Zionism, 178 *et seq.*
Mizwah (commandment), developed from minhag (custom), 71.
Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!, The, essay by George Eliot, on Jewish nationalism, 45-46.
Mohammedan political doctrines, 164.
Mohilever, Rabbi, leader of the Chovevi Zion movement, 78.
Mombassa, port of East African Protectorate, 123.
Mommsen, Theodor, attacks Graetz's history, 181-182; advises conversion to Christianity, 206.
Moniteur Universelle, alluded to, 39.
Montefiore, Claude, on Zionism, 100.
Montefiore, Sir Moses, intervenes in the Damascus blood accusation affair, 49-50; interested in the Jews of the East, 50.
Moses, Ahad ha-Am on, 75-76.
Munich, chosen as meeting place of First Zionist Congress, 113; Jewish students' societies at, 148, 149.
Munk, Salomon, intervenes in the Damascus blood accusation, 49-50; quoted, on the Jews of the East, 50-51.
Myerson, M., organizer of the Chovevi Zion movement, 72.

Nachtasyl, term coined for East Africa, 129.
Napoleon, Jewish nationalist scheme of, 39.
Nation, definition of, 33-34.
National Fund. See Jewish National Fund.
Nationalism, revived, 24; and the Jews, 26; marked by chauvinism; 26; and language, 56-57.
Nationalism, Jewish, and race, 33; as defined by Smolenskin, 34-35; civic and social, 34; in the West, 35-41; Christian sympathizers with, 39-47; and the second coming of Christ, 41; Alexandre Dumas fils on, 42; Henry Dunant on, 42-43; George Eliot on, 43-47; awakens interest in the Hebrew language, 55-59; not fostered in Western Europe, 70; Ahad ha-Am on, 76, 189 *et seq.;* the Kadimah imbued with, 86; in opposition to Reform, 98; the heart of Zionism, 105. See also Chovevi Zion; Hibbat Zion; Zionism.
Nationalist sentiments, and Socialism, 166-167.
Nationalists, Jewish, 36-41.
Natural sciences, the, and internationalism, 24.
Nes Ziyyona. See Wadi el-Hanin.
Netter, Charles, interested in the Jews of the East, 50; quoted, on relation of Jews of Europe to Palestine, 51-52; inspired by Hirsch Kalischer, 54.
Neue Freie Presse, Vienna, Herzl Paris representative of, 85; Herzl feuilleton editor of, 86; attitude of, toward Zionism, 94.
New York, alluded to, 106.
Newlinsky, Chevalier de, emissary of the Turkish Sultan, 93.
Nile, the, alluded to, 122.
Noah, Mordecai Manuel, as a Jewish nationalist, 38-39.
Nöldeke, Theodor, advises Jews to educate children as Christians, 206.
Nordau, on Herzl, 92; favors loyal intercourse with Turkey, 162-163.
Not This Is the Way, article by Ahad ha-Am, 74.

Observances, Jewish, influence of the modern spirit on, 204.
Odessa, center of Chovevi Zion movement, 72; alluded to, 74.
Odessa Committee, the, of the Chovevi Zion, influential in the movement, 72-73; nationalist in sentiment, 78; to be represented in organization proposed at Palestine Congress, 133. See also Chovevi Zion movement, the.
Oliphant, Laurence, Christian sympathizer with Jewish nationalism, 41.
"Onwards-Eastwards." See Kadimah, the.
Oppenheimer, Franz, the Poale Zion followers of, 169.
Organization, an achievement of Zionism, 108-109; debates on, in the Congresses, 172; of Jewry, Zionism fails in, 213 *et seq.;* of Jewry, philanthropic agencies fail in, 213 *et seq.*
Orthodoxy, detrimental effect of, on Jews, 30; and secularization of Hebrew, 58; favorable to colonization of Palestine, 70-71; hostile to Zionism, 95;

opposes Zionism for religious reasons, 96-97; Zionism not opposed to, 177; congruous with Zionism, 199-200.
Otranto, alluded to, 203.
Ottoman statehood, Zionism in no way hostile to, 163-164. See also Ottomanism.
Ottomanischer Lloyd, the, Constantinople, expresses German opposition to Jewish colonists in Palestine, 158.
Ottomanism, Zionism represented as incompatible with, 160; said to be endangered by Zionism, 161; Zionist leaders insist upon, 161 *et seq.;* the excesses of, 164; future prosperity of, conditioned on decentralization, 164. See also Ottoman statehood.

Padua, alluded to, 52.
Paganism, and a universal Christian community, 24.
Palestine, the loss of, as viewed by the Reformers, 23; return to, in the creed, 35; attitude of Jews towards, 35-36; Jews in, during the Middle Ages, 48-49; Charles Netter on, 51-52; new conception of place of, in Jewish life, 52 *et seq.;* Samuel David Luzzatto on, 52; the schools of, 59; why holy, in Pinsker's view, 64; the purchase of, advocated, 67; agricultural colonies in, 76-77; Herzl not fascinated by, 90-91; charter for, offered to Herzl, 93; place of, in the Basel Program, 115-116; study of, under the Tchioh, 149; institutions in, supported by general Jewish sentiment for, 155; the general sentiment for, fostered by the Palestine Commission, 155-156; prejudice towards Zionism in, 158; in a decentralized Turkey, 164; tilled by Arabs, 169; cultural aspects of resettlement in, Ahad ha-Am on, 190-191; a spiritual center, 191; the revival of Hebrew in, 193-194; general revival of culture in, 194-195; too small for a large portion of the Jewish race, 208; Zionist work in, 213; political status of, dependent on that of Turkey, 215.
Palestine Commission, the, place of, in the Zionist movement, 154; criticism of plans of, 154-155; value of work of, 155-156.
Palestine, the colonization of, early advocates of, 37; Jewish organizations refuse to be interested in, 42; stimulated by Russian-Jewish troubles, 48; Samuel David Luzzatto on, 52; Hirsch Kalischer on, 52-54; early attempts at, unsuccessful, 55; and the cultivation of Hebrew, 59; Pinsker at head of society for, 67; Lilienblum on, 68; associated with Orthodox tenets, 71; advanced by the Odessa Committee of the Chovevi Zion, 72-73; as viewed by Eastern Jews, 78; supported by various organizations, 79; as a philanthropy, 79-81; participation of Baron Edmond de Rothschild in, 80-81; participation of Jewish Colonization Association in, 81; a generally acceptable element in Zionism, 104-105;

Herzl's attitude toward, 117-118; deprecated by the "politicals," 151-152; objected to, for the sake of Turkey, 162. See also Hibbat Ziyyon; Chovevi Zion; Palestinian Zionism; Ziyyone Zionists; Agricultural colonies in Palestine.
Palestine Zionist Congress, organization proposed by, 133; alluded to, 153.
Palestinian Jews, the, alluded to, 201.
Palestinian Zionism, emphasized, 151 *et seq.;* advocated by the Ziyyone Zionists, 152; Ussischkin leader of, 153; advanced under Wolffsohn, 153; victorious at Congress of 1911, 154; Warburg on, 154; and the Palestine Commission, 154; danger in, 155-156; favored by recent events in Turkey, 156 *et seq.;* a phase in the development of the movement, 165. See also Chovevi Zion movement, the; Palestine, the colonization of, etc.
Paris, alluded to, 39, 203; Herzl in, 85.
Parsees, the, alluded to, 184.
Parties, in Great Britain, 171.
Patriotism, and Zionism, 208 *et seq.*
Pesaro, alluded to, 203.
Petah Tikwah (Melebbes), early colony in Palestine, 55, 76.
Pétavel, Abraham, on the restoration, 219.
Pharmacy, Jewish students of, form society, 149.
Philanthropy in the colonization of Palestine, 78, 79, 79-81.
Philo, alluded to, 202.
Pineles, L., supporter of the Chovevi Zion movement, 72.
Pinsker, Leo, alarmed by the effects of anti-Semitism on Jews, 62; analyzes the situation with reference to the Jews, 62-64; agrees with Moses Hess, 63; a territorialist, 64; work by, 64-66; influences Lilienblum, 67; influences Rülf, 70; influence of, in Russia, 71; at the head of the Chovevi Zion movement, 72, 78; alluded to, 72, 73, 74, 142; forerunner of Herzl, 82, 83, 89; alluded to, 142; insists upon understanding with Constantinople, 161.
Plehve, von, Herzl in consultation with, 127.
Poale Zion, the, and the East African proposal, 136-137; Zionist labor party, 165; origin of, 168; spread of, 168; Zionist principles of, 169; followers of Franz Oppenheimer, 169-170; new form of Zionist federation, 170-171; alluded to, 172; offshoot from, 228.
Poles, in Austria-Hungary, 211; in Germany, 211; the, secure national recognition in the Workingmen's Democratic Party, 175-176.
Political Zionism, in abeyance, 151 *et seq.;* principles of, 151-152; a phase in the development of the movement, 165.
Pork eating advised by Salomon Reinach for Jews, 27.
Portuguese Government, invites Jews to settle in Angola, 125.
"Practical work" in Palestine, colonization of Palestine, 54. See Palestine, the colonization of; Ziyyone Zionists, etc.
Prague, Jewish students' society at, 148.

Prayers, the, modified by the Reformers, 23, 99.
Pre-Herzlites, Western, 36-41.
Preussische Jahrbücher, the, reference to, 206.
Proletarian movement, the, in Russia, 173 *et seq.*
Promised Land, the. See Palestine.
Prophets, the, extremists, 192.
Protestantism, and the Jews, 25.
Proudhon, Moses Hess adherent of, 36.
Prussian Jewish communities, alluded to, 103.
Psalms, the, commentary on, quoted, 17, 19.

Rabbiner-Verband, the German, holds Zionism and patriotism to be incompatible, 210.
Rabbinical Conference, the Frankfort, on the restoration of the Jewish state, 23.
Rabbino Maggiore, a title without religious significance, 110.
Rabinowitz, S. P., leader of the Chovevi Zion movement, 78.
Race, and Jewish nationalism, 33.
Racial unity, citizenship not coincident with, 210-212.
Ratti Menton, French consul at Damascus, raises blood accusation, 49.
Rebirth of the Jewish People in the Holy Land of Their Ancestors, work by Lilienblum, 68.
Red Cross, the, founder of, 42.
"Red ticket," the, revival of, 118.
Reform movement, the, destroys unity of Jewish practice and hope, 28-29, 30; hostile to Zionism, 95; hostility of, to Judaism, 98-99; desires development of Jewish law, 106; antithetic to Zionism, 146; Graetz on, 183; Zionism incongruous with, 199-200; the mission theory of, not incompatible with Zionism, 207-208. See also Reformers, the.
Reform services, Prussian Government asked to inhibit introduction of, 103.
Reformation, the, and the Jews, 25.
Reformers, the, and political emancipation, 20; and the ceremonial law, 21-22; and Jewish belief, 22; and the Jewish dispersion, 22-23; theory of, superseded, 23; advise abrogating Jewish customs to meet anti-Semitism, 27. See also Reform movement, the.
Reggio, alluded to, 203.
Rehobot, Palestine colony, a Bene Mosheh creation, 76.
Reinach, Salomon, advises modification of the Jewish law, 27.
Reinach, Théodore, demands civic perfection of the Jew, 209-210.
Reines, Rabbi J., founder of the Mizrachi, 177.
Religion and citizenship in Rome, 25.
Religious considerations in Zionism, 176.
Renaissance, the, and a universal Christian community, 24; and the Jews, 25.
Resettlement of the land of Israel, the. See Palestine, the colonization of.
Resh Geluta, lay head of Jewish community in Babylon, 110.
Restoration, the, of the Jewish state, Reformers on, 23; Pinsker's view of, not religious, 64;

Spinoza on, 217; Steinthal, Franck, and Cohen on, 217. See also under Palestine.
Return of the Exiles, work by Lilienblum, 67.
Rishon le-Zion, early agricultural colony in Palestine, 76; alluded to, 81.
Ritual changes, made by Reformers, 21, 28.
Roman Church, the, and a universal Christian community, 23-24.
Roman culture, compared with Hellenism, 29.
Rome, the Jews in, 24-25; alluded to, 203.
Rome and Jerusalem, the Latest National Question, work by Moses Hess, 37-38; how received, 37-38; influences Graetz, 38; by Hess, forerunner of the *Judenstaat,* 89.
Rosh Pinnah, early agricultural colony in Palestine, 76.
Rothschild, Baron Edmond de, interested in Palestine only as a philanthropist, 79; large participation of, in Palestine colonization, 80-81; and the Wine Growers' Association, 81; to be represented in organization proposed at Palestine Congress, 133.
Roumania, the Jews of, affected by anti-Semitism, 27; the Chovevi Zion movement in, 72; Jews from, settle in Palestine, 76; Jewish question in, viewed optimistically, 100.
Roumanian Jewish students, in Germany, 146; in Vienna, 147.
Rülf, Isaac, espouses the Hibbat Ziyyon movement, 69; connection of, with Russo-Jewish exodus, 70; influenced by Pinsker, 70; work by, 70; forerunner of Herzl, 82, 89; alluded to, 142.
Russia, Jews from, settle in Palestine, 49, 76; Jewish question in, viewed optimistically, 100; the proletarian movement in, 173 *et seq.*
Russia, the Jews of, affected by anti-Semitism, 27; interested in colonization of Palestine, 48; use unliterary Hebrew, 56; effect of anti-Semitism on, 60-61; why inclined to territorialism, 64; and the Hibbat Ziyyon movement, 71-72.
Russian Jewish students, in Germany, 146; in Vienna, 147.
Russian Workingmen's Democratic Party, the Bund a section of, 173; demands complete assimilation, 173; the Bund breaks with, 174; recognizes the Poles as a nationality, 175.

Saadia, alluded to, 202.
Sabaheddin, Prince, favors Ottoman decentralization, 164.
Sabbataï Zebi, alluded to, 36; Dönmeh followers of, 160.
Sabbath violation, advised by Salomon Reinach, 27.
Safed, Jews in, during the Middle Ages, 49.
St. Petersburg, alluded to, 126.
Salvador, Joseph, historian, as a Jewish nationalist, 40.
Samaria, alluded to, 77.
Sängerbund, a German contribution to American life, 211.
"Sanhedrin," Napoleon's, 39.
Schatz, Boris, founder of the Bezalel school, 194.

Schopenhauer, advises conversion to Christianity, 206.
Second Jewish Commonwealth, historian of, 40.
Sects, Jewish, fewness of, 201.
Sefardim, the, alluded to, 20; use Spanish, 57.
Self-emancipation, preached by Pinsker, 64-65; means for securing, 65-66.
Sermons, in the synagogue, a plea for, 183.
Servians, the, in Turkey, 159.
Shapira, Professor, leader of the Chovevi Zion movement, 78.
Shekel money, the, withheld from use in connection with East African proposal, 131.
Shulhan Aruk, the, threatens petrifaction, 106.
Siedlungsgenossenschaft, form of settlements in Palestine, supported by the Poale Zion, 169-170.
Singer, a socialist and a Jew, 167.
Slavs, the, manifest national consciousness, 24.
Smolenskin, Perez, on Jewish nationalism, 34-35; names the Kadimah, 147.
Social-Democratic Party. See Russian Workingmen's Democratic Party.
Socialism, Jews founders of, 26, 167; anti-religious and anti-national, 166-167; and Zionism squared by the Poale Zion, 168-169.
Socialists, the, refuse to espouse cause of persecuted Jews, 167.
Society of Jews, a, demanded by Herzl, 89-90.
Solomon ben Adret, alluded to, 201.
Sonino, example of a modern Jewish statesman, 92.
Sons of Moses. See Bene Mosheh.
Spain, alluded to, 204.
Spanish, the, supersedes Hebrew in the Semitic East, 57.
Spinoza, alluded to, 202; on the restoration to Palestine, 217.
Statesmen among modern Jews, 91-92.
Steinschneider, alluded to, 182; intention underlying investigations of, 183.
Steinthal, H., on Zion, 217.
Strassburg, Jewish students' societies at, 148, 149; alluded to, 206.
Students' societies, in Austria, 147-148; in Germany, 148-150; in Germany, bulwark against anti-Semitism and conversion, 150-151.
Suczawa, Jewish students' society at, 148.
Synagogue, the, democratic, 110; in modern times, 204.
Syrian and Palestinian Colonization Society, founded by Henry Dunant, 43.

Tachkemoni schools, the, of the Mizrachi, make justified demands, 179; purpose of, 194.
Talmud, the, quoted, 17, 19, 98, 138.
Tancred, nationalist tendencies in Disraeli's, 40.
Tanganyika, Lake, boundary of East African Protectorate, 123.
Tchioh, Zionist society at Köthen, 149.
Technical School, the, at Haifa, result of Palestine sentiment, 155.

Tendenzschriften, characterization of works of modern Jewish historians, 183.
Territorialism. See Ito movement, the.
Thomas, Father, disappearance of, causes Damascus blood accusation, 49.
Thorn, alluded to, 52.
Thuringia, the, Breslau Jewish students' society, 148.
Tiberias, Jews in, during the Middle Ages, 49.
Tiberias, Sea of, early Jewish settlement at, 55.
Times, the London, alluded to, 160.
Trading-companies, English, Herzl's model, 90.
Traditional Judaism, society for strengthening, 149. See also Orthodoxy.
Treitschke, Heinrich von, attacks Graetz's history, 181-182.
Trietsch, Davis, advocates Cyprus colonization, 120.
Turkey, under Sultan Abdul Hamid, 117; and Cyprus, 120; recent events in, favorable to Palestinian Zionism, 156 *et seq.;* awakened patriotism in, 157-158; prejudice towards Zionism in, 158 *et seq.;* Zionism favors loyal intercourse with, 161 *et seq.;* distraught state of, 215.
Turkish dominion in Palestine hostile to Jews, 48.

Union and Progress, Committee of, and Zionism, 158; influenced by the Alliance Israélite Universelle, 159-160.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the, hold Zionism and patriotism to be incompatible, 210.
United States, the, growth of, and the national consciousness, 24; alluded to, 54; the Chovevi Zion movement in, 72; protest against the "red ticket," 118; an example of racial diversity, 211-212. See also America.
Unity, Jewish, threatened in modern times, 204-205.
Universal Race Congress, the, projected by a Jew, 26.
Universalism. See Internationalism; Christian community, a universal.
Universalistic movements, promoted by Jews, 26.
Ussischkin, Michael, presides over a Congress in Palestine, 133; a Chovevi Zionist, 133; leader of Palestinian Zionism, 153; antagonizes Herzl, 153.

Verbindungen, at German universities, nationalistic, 146.
Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, founded by Christians, 27.
Viadrina, the, Breslau Jewish students' society, 148.
Vienna, alluded to, 72, 88, 97, 160; in touch with Eastern Jews. 86; the center of Zionist activity, 144; advantages and disadvantages of, 144-145; hostile to Herzl, 145.
Vienna University, the, Herzl educated at, 84; anti-Semitism at, 85; and the Kadimah, 147, 148.
Vilna, the Mizrachi formed at, 177.
Vilna Conference, the, on the East African proposal, 135.
Voskhod, the, opposes Zionism.

Wadi el-Hanin (Nes Ziyyona), early agricultural colony in Palestine, 76.
Wales, alluded to, 56.
Walloons, in Germany, 211.
Warburg, Otto, presides over Central Committee, 151; on Palestinian Zionism, 154; chairman of the Palestine Commission, 154.
Way of Life, The, article by Ahad ha-Am, 74-75, 78, 189.
Welsh culture rescued, 57.
Wends, in Germany, 211.
Western Jews, and political emancipation, 19-20; effect of exodus of Eastern Jews on, 31-34; the, not acquainted with Judeo-German works, 69-70; not interested in Jewish nationalism, 70; compared with Eastern Jews, 77-78; the, in moral slavery, 190.
William II, of Germany, on citizenship and racial diversity, 211.
Wine Growers' Association, the, prosperous, 81.
Witte, Herzl in consultation with, 127.
Wolf, Lucien, on Zionism, 100.
Wolffsohn, David, Herzl's successor, 153; advances Palestinian Zionism, 153-154; favors loyal intercourse with Turkey, 163.
Workingmen's Democratic Party. See Russian Workingmen's Democratic Party.

Xenopol, advises conversion to Christianity, 206.

Yates, Robert P., and the East African proposal, 123.
Yiddish. See Judeo-German.
Yishub Erez Yisraël. See Palestine, the colonization of.
Young Judaea, alluded to, 150.

Zamenhof, Lazarus Ludwig, promoter of a universalistic movement, 26; a nationalist Jew, 218.
Zangwill, Israel, accords appreciation to Herzl's scheme, 87; secures Herzl's appearance in London, 87; affirms delegates to Sixth Congress to have been in favor of East African proposal, 130; leader of the Ito movement, 137; as a Zionist, 138; on Palestine, 138-139; protests against policy of Jewish philanthropic societies, 139; on Zionism, 139; opposition of, to Zionism, 140.
Zikron Yaäkob, early agricultural colony in Palestine, 76; alluded to, 81.
Zionism, proper time for estimate of, 18; Moses Hess forerunner of, 37; the platform of, accepted by the Chovevi Zion, 73; supersedes the Chovevi Zion movement, 73, 79; public discussion of, inaugurated by Herzl, 87; attitude of Neue Freie Presse towards, 94; hostility to, 95; effect of, on indifferent Jews, 95-96; religious difficulties connected with, 96-97; deepens Jewishness, 97; J. H. Dünner on, 97; M. Friedländer on, 98; hostility of Reform to, 98-99; welcomed by the Russian Hebrew press, 99; Russian Jewish press hostile to, 99; M. Güdemann on, 99-100; Lucien Wolf on, 100; K. Kohler on, 100; Claude

Montefiore on, 100; feared as anti-patriotic, 101; Laurie Magnus on, 101; Central Conference of American Rabbis on, 102; Ludwig Geiger on, 102, 103; Association of Jewish Rabbis in Germany on, 103-104; place of Palestine colonization in, 104-105; the heart of, 105; cause of strife in Jewish communities, 105-106; a vivifying force, 107; a policy of organization, 108-109; objection to, in democracy of Jew, 111; accused of speaking for the whole Jewish people, though it represents only a part, 112-113; universalism of, 113; object of, defined by the Basel Program, 114-116; political view of, 116-118; and a fully independent Jewish state, 126; split in, 136-137; compared with Itoism, 141; how affected by death of Herzl, 143; not a one-man movement, 143-144; commission leadership of, 144; removal of seat of, from Vienna to Germany, 145-146; development of, in Germany, 146 *et seq.;* German leadership of, 151; danger to, from Palestinian work, 156; Charterism not equivalent of, 157; and the Committee of Union and Progress, 158; prejudice towards, in Palestine and Turkey, 158 *et seq.;* represented as incompatible with Ottomanism, 159-160; Turkish officials ignorant of, 161; accused of being a Jewish intrigue against Ottomanism, 161; leaders of, insist upon Ottoman sovereignty, 161 *et seq.;* in no way hostile to Ottoman statehood, 163-164; phases in the development of, 165 *et seq.;* squared with Socialism, by the Poale Zion, 168-169; and a Jewish peasant population, 169; accepts certain demands of the Poale Zion and the Democratic Fraction, 170; the Poale Zion a novel grouping under, 170-171; reproach against, by the Bund, 175; why junction of, with Bund impossible, 175; religious questions in, 176-177; effect of the Mizrachi on, 178 *et seq.;* Ahad ha-Am's opposition to, 191-192; takes account of Jewish diversity, 194-195; necessity for the instruments of, 195-196; idealism of, 196-197; supposed to have no message for the emancipated Jew, 198-199; supposed to have a message for the Orthodox Jew, 199-200; supposed to be in opposition to the Jewish mission, 200 *et seq.;* fallacies concerning, 207 *et seq.;* the Reform mission theory compatible with, 207-208; and patriotism, 208 *et seq.;* no conflict between citizenship and, 212-213; work of, in Palestine, 213; small success of, in organizing Jewry, 213 *et seq.;* offers basis for organization of Jewry, 215; speculations on the future of, 215-216; equivalent to Judaism, 216.

Zionism, political. See Political Zionism.

Zionism, practical. See Palestinian Zionism.

Zionist activity, change in, 151 *et seq.*
Zionist character of the German juvenile societies, 150.
Zionist meetings and collections, forbidden in Russia, 127.
Zionist students' society, first official, 149.
Zionistic Territorial Organization, a sign of the secession at the Seventh Zionist Congress, 136; Zangwill leader of, 136. See Ito movement, the. See also Palestinian Zionism; Chovevi Zion; Palestine, the colonization of.
Ziyyone Zionists, the, insist upon Palestine work, 119; and the East African proposal, 135; extreme Palestinians, 152; mostly Russians, 153. See also Palestinian Zionism, etc.
Zoroastrianism, alluded to, 184.
Zunz, alluded to, 182; work by, 183.

The Lord Baltimore Press
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.